REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 767 JC 670 246

JUNIOR COLLEGES--20 STATES.

BY- YARRINGTON, ROGER

AMERICAN ASSN. OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, WASHINGTON,D.C.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.64 191P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, MASTER PLANS, *STATE LEGISLATION, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, *EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, *STATE PROGRAMS, *EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, EDUCATIONAL POLICY, EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, GOVERNANCE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

REPRESENTED IN THIS COLLECTION OF UPDATED ARTICLES ORIGINALLY APPEARING IN THE "JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL" DURING 1963-65 ARE 20 CASE STUDIES OF STATES AS THEY HAVE APPROACHED THE QUESTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION. WHILE THESE STATES SHARE A COMMON GOAL (THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STATEWIDE SYSTEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES) THEIR STORIES VARY IN METHOD, TEMPO, AND DEGREE OF SUCCESS. EACH STATE STARTS FROM A DIFFERENT POINT AND MUST MOVE IN THE WAY THAT SUITS ITS NEED AND POTENTIAL, FOR EXAMPLE, IN ORGANIZATIONAL BASIS AND FINANCE. THE PRESENCE OF COMMON FACTORS CAN ALSO BE CITED AS ESSENTIAL TO JUNIOR COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT IN A STATE. THESE INCLUDE COOPERATION AMONG EDUCATORS, CITIZEN AWARENESS, CAREFUL STUDIES, LEGISLATIVE PLANNING, AND PERSISTENT LEADERSHIP. THE CASE STUDIES INCLUDE ALABAMA, ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, FLORIDA, HAWAII, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, MISSOURI, NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, NORTH CAROLINA, OHIO, OREGON, PENNSYLVANIA, TEXAS, AND WASHINGTON. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1315 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036, FOR $2.00. (AL)

ED011767

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

XX

20

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 21 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JUNIOR COLLEGES: 20 STATES

JC 670 246

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

XX

20

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JUNIOR COLLEGES: 20 STATES

ii 1966/American Association of Junior Colleges

Junior Colleges: 20 States

Articles on State Developments
Reprinted from the
Junior College Journal

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 66-18170
© Copyright American Association of Junior Colleges 1966

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Printed in U.S.A.

Price: $2.00

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY American Assn. of Junior Colleges & individual authors TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Contents

Introduction vii

Roger Yarrington

Missouri: How We Got Started in St. Louis 1

Mildred E. Bastian

Progress in Maryland 18

Frank B. Pesci and Robert T. Novak

The Explosion in Arizona 27

Robert J. Hannelly

The Oregon Story 33

Don P. Pence

Five Years of Progress in Florida 49

James L. Wattenbarger

North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges 56

Howard R. Boozer

Bold Plans for the Bay State 66

Walter M. Taylor

Something New in New Jersey 75

Kenneth C. MacKay

Washington Shows New Life at Forty 85

Frederic T. Giles

Fifty Years of Community Involvement in Michigan 93

Philip J. Gannon

Ohio Joins the Club 103

Charles E. Chapman

It May Happen in Alabama, Too! 114

Walter A. Graham

Crossroads in Texas 120
Kathleen Bland Smith
Pennsylvania Opens the Door 128
A. Martin Eldersveld
Full Partners in California's Higher Education 135
Henry T. Tyler
Progress and Plans in the Empire State 145
S. V. Martorana
Rebirth in Illinois 154
Clifford G. Erickson
Iowa Sets Its Course 159
Louis R. Newsham
Hawaii Plans for Community Colleges 167
Richard H. Kosaki
Minnesota Turns to State Junior Colleges 174
Philip C. Helland

Introduction

Here is one of the most exciting stories in higher education today—the rapid growth in numbers of junior colleges.

In the fall of 1965 fifty new junior colleges opened, making a total of some 780 in the nation. By 1970 there will be 1,000.

The reason for this unprecedented growth may be found by looking at steps recently taken in a number of states. The stories of twenty of these states are reported in this booklet. In general, they are stories of states that have recognized a need for increased opportunity for higher education, have commissioned studies, written master plans, passed legislation, and begun building. The goal: statewide systems of community junior colleges.

These are states that are looking to the day when low-cost, comprehensive, community-oriented, two-year colleges will be located within commuting distance of every citizen. The stories vary in method, tempo, and degree of success; but that is the theme which runs through the book.

Originally, these reports were published as articles in the *Junior College Journal* during 1963-65. The earlier articles have been updated for this volume.

Other states could have been included in the collection. But this booklet is not designed to be a complete story of junior college developments in the various states. That would be impossible for this is a running story with new developments in a dozen states every week. Rather, this booklet is a collection of case examples which illustrate the "why" and "how" of current junior college growth.

And, to some degree, this is also a how-to-do-it handbook. For when one reads what has happened in the twenty states represented here one sees how junior colleges can be developed in other states.

However, the articles also illustrate the fact that each state starts from a different point and must move in the way that suits its need and potential. Thus, Maryland is developing junior colleges under unified school districts (although this may change), while Pennsylvania has chosen independent junior college districts, and California is in the midst of changing from the former to the latter, and Minnesota has chosen another way altogether: a state-level board of control. In the area of finance, Oregon fixes the state's contribution to operating expenses in terms of full-time student equivalents, North Carolina in terms of percentages, Iowa in terms of student days, and Massachusetts pays the whole bill from the state budget, while in Ohio the state proportion is not stipulated at all.

Nevertheless, some guidelines do emerge and it becomes apparent that certain factors must be present for junior colleges to develop in a state: cooperation among educators, citizen awareness, careful studies, legislative planning, persistent leadership.

But the most important message of the book is the simple testimony from twenty states: "It can be done; we are building junior colleges."

The authors of the articles:

Mildred E. Bastian is chairman of the board of trustees of the St. Louis-St. Louis County Junior College District in St. Louis, Missouri.

Robert T. Novak and Frank B. Pesci were administrators at Prince George's Community College in Maryland at the time their article was written. Dr. Novak was president, and Dr. Pesci was dean of academic affairs. The former has since become president of Orange County Community College in New York. The article was revised for this booklet by Dr. Pesci, who is still dean at P.G.C.C.

Robert J. Hannelly is president of the Maricopa County Junior College District in Arizona.

Don P. Pence is president of Central Oregon College.

James L. Wattenbarger is director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the Florida Department of Education.

Howard R. Boozer is associate director, North Carolina State Board of Higher Education.

Walter M. Taylor was executive director of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges when he wrote his article. Now he is director of continuing education at the College of the Virgin Islands. His article was updated for this volume by *William G. Dwyer,* president of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges.

Kenneth C. MacKay is president of Union Junior College in New Jersey.

Frederic T. Giles is professor of higher education at the University of Washington.

Philip J. Gannon is dean of Lansing Community College in Michigan.

Charles E. Chapman is president of Cuyahoga Community College in Ohio.

Walter A. Graham is president of Southern Union State Junior College in Alabama.

Kathleen Bland Smith is director of news and information at San Jacinto College in Texas.

A. Martin Eldersveld was director of the Bureau of Community Colleges, Department of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania when his article was published in the *Journal.* Now Dr. Eldersveld is president of Prince George's Community College in Maryland.

Henry T. Tyler is executive secretary of the California Junior College Association.

S. V. Martorana is executive dean for two-year colleges in the State University of New York.

Clifford G. Erickson was executive dean of Chicago City Junior College when he wrote about trends in Illinois. He is still active in the state's junior college development but in a new capacity: he is now president of Rock Valley College in Rockford.

Louis R. Newsham is dean of Fort Dodge Community College in Iowa and, at the time he wrote his article for the *Journal,* he was president of the Iowa Junior College Association.

Richard H. Kosaki is vice-president for community colleges, University of Hawaii.

Philip C. Helland is executive director of the Minnesota State Junior College Board.

We appreciate the contributions made by these authors to the *Journal* and to this booklet.

We are also grateful to Louise Scott Wrigley, editorial assistant, and Sylvia Lindsey, secretary, for their help in assembling and updating this collection of articles.

Roger Yarrington, *Editor*
Junior College Journal

1

Missouri: How We Got Started in St. Louis

By Mildred E. Bastian

The mighty Mississippi River marks the eastern boundary of the Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County, Missouri. From the river, the district sprawls some 550 square miles—through the densely populated and developed urban section, through the newly developing, suburban, residential area, through heavily wooded, rolling countryside, through vast acres of rich farmland. More than 1.5 million people live in the city and county and are served by the J.C.D.

The district is financed by state and local tax funds and student fees. It is controlled locally by an elected board of trustees, two from the city and four from the county. Classes are operated on three separate campuses, one in the city and two in the county.

The Junior College District was created by a vote of the people on April 3, 1962. On Labor Day, 1962, Dr. Joseph P. Cosand came to St. Louis to assume his duties as the first president of the district. He left Santa Barbara City College in California, persuaded by the J.C.D. trustees that there was an unparalleled opportunity to build an excellent junior college program in St. Louis. He responded to what was, indeed, a rare challenge. The district had a one-room office and a part-time secretary. There was no staff, no program, no students. There was, however, a great potential and there was goodwill in the community for the success of this new venture.

Dr. Cosand brought with him a wealth of experience in California's well-known junior college system. His professional competence was demonstrated by the rapidity and skill with which he proceeded. Within a few short weeks he had gathered together the nucleus of an excellent staff; moved into administrative offices in a mid-town former Victorian "mansion"; found two strategically located high schools where evening classes could be offered; began the long search for well-qualified faculty dedicated to the concept of a true community college program.

Today, as we review the growth and development which have taken place, even we who have been privileged to share in this undertaking are a little awed. We believe, with Tertullian, "It is certain because it is impossible."

This is a capsule picture of the J.C.D. as it has emerged since April,1962:

The administrative offices are located in Clayton, Missouri, almost in the geographic center of the district.

The district has acquired three campus sites, strategically located so that they are accessible from all parts of the area served.

Meramec Community College is on a seventy-eight-acre tract in Kirkwood, a suburb in South County. It is currently operating classes in temporary frame buildings from eight o'clock in the morning until ten o'clock at night. The district's master plan provides facilities for an enrollment of 4,500 students by the early 1970s. The first core of permanent buildings is expected to be ready for 3,500 students in the fall of 1967.

Forest Park Community College now offers classes at Roosevelt High School in St. Louis, from four o'clock in the evening until ten o'clock at night. It will have the first permanent buildings in the district, on its thirty-seven-acre campus on Oakland Avenue across from beautiful Forest Park. The first core of buildings are now under construction, will be ready by February, 1967, and are expected to accommodate 3,000 students. When the campus is fully developed, it is expected to enroll 7,000 students.

Florissant Valley Community College is on a 108-acre site in Ferguson, a suburb in North County. It is operating classes in temporary frame buildings, as is Meramec, from 8 a.m. until 10 p.m. The master plan provides for facilities to accommodate 4,500 students by the early 1970s, with the first core of permanent buildings for 3,500 in the fall of 1967.

To date, the district has used revenue derived from a 10-cent levy on property for both operating costs and capital expenditures. Acquisition of all three campuses, the construction of the temporary buildings, all equipment and furnishings, all remodeling, have been financed out of current revenue. In addition, a reserve fund is available which will be supplemented by a federal grant (under the Higher Education Facilities Act) to complete the permanent buildings now under construction on the Forest Park campus.

It was obvious that the local tax source was not producing enough revenue to finance the permanent buildings. Therefore, the board of trustees submitted a bond issue in the amount of $47,220,000 on November 16, 1965. Voters approved the proposal by more than 74 per cent majority, making it possible to move ahead with plans for permanent buildings on all three campuses by the fall of 1967.

Enrollment and Opportunity

As the 1965-66 academic year began, more than 6,900 students were enrolled on the three campuses. They could choose from a variety of programs, from the traditional transfer or degree-oriented course of study to terminal technical programs of one or two years' duration aimed at immediate job placement upon completion.

Students may attend any of the three campuses, regardless of where they live. Transfer, straight academic courses are offered on all campuses. In the interest of economical and efficient operation, however, not all technical courses are offered on all campuses. Engineering technology is concentrated at Florissant Valley, with students permitted to complete the first requirements at one of the other campuses if they so choose. Professional nursing programs are offered at both Meramec and Forest Park. At Forest Park, too, there is a hotel, motel, and restaurant program. And it is on the Forest Park Campus that the exciting "opportunity program" is being developed (with a foundation grant for research) to help underachievers who are highly motivated.

Though many of our students are recent high school graduates, the J.C.D., like community colleges elsewhere, attracts the mature men and women who enroll in courses for self-improvement, for job advancement, or even for the pure joy of learning. It is an exciting student body.

This, then, was the J.C.D. as we began a new school year in 1965. In the three short years of its existence it has maintained an orderly, though rapid pace. Those of us who have watched over it are aware that it began with an excellent framework and that many important events preceded its creation in April, 1962. For that reason, perhaps this story should begin four years before, in 1958, with the involvement of people in the community in a study of their higher educational needs.

Showing the Need

In mid-1958 the Committee on Higher Educational Needs of Metropolitan St. Louis (a subcommittee appointed by the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School in Missouri) undertook an intensive survey and study of the needs of young people and the community for higher education. The study was financed by contributions from business, labor, industry, public schools; services were contributed by two, fine, private, local institutions, St. Louis University and Washington University. The committee studied for more than a year before reporting—to the governor's committee and to the community—in January, 1960. No group or organization had previously given thoughtful consideration to the problem of college education for the ever increasing numbers of students then enrolled in the area's elementary and high schools. It was, therefore, a shocked and startled community which took a long, hard look at the committee's findings:

Admission pressures: Twice as many young people in city and county would be seeking admission to college by 1966, and three times as many by 1973.

Abilities: I.Q.'s of 110 or more were recorded for 39 per cent of the seniors in the area's high schools; 41 per cent had I.Q.'s ranging between 100 and 110.

College Costs: Not only had tuitions in the area more than doubled in the preceding nine years, but the cost of living away from home had soared. The closest state institutions were 125 miles from St. Louis. Too many able students were not going on to college. Thirty-eight per cent of city and 36.8 per cent of county seniors listed "lack of finance" as their reason for not entering college.

Diverse educational needs: Not all young people of ability wish to pursue a baccalaureate degree—nor should they. Industry needs well-trained technicians; two-year, terminal-technical programs could prepare many young people for careers. St. Louis stood almost alone among large metropolitan areas in the nation in its failure to provide post-high school technical training.

Selective admissions: Local independent colleges and universities were becoming increasingly selective, thus closing still another door to many able young people who did not score high on college entrance examinations. The slow-to-mature students were being denied an opportunity to begin a college career.

In short, St. Louis was failing to provide for the needs of its young people graduating in 1958 and 1959, and unless a major breakthrough could be made, the future was bleak indeed.

The first, and major, recommendation among the fourteen made by the Committee on Higher Education was for the establishment of a two-year, public college, financed by state and local taxes and student tuition, offering curriculums both terminal and transfer in nature. Implementation required passage of enabling legislation—hopefully in the 1961 session of the Missouri legislature—and the community was urged to work toward this end.

Report to the Community

The report, "Higher Education and the Future of Youth in Metropolitan St. Louis," has since been given national recognition. It was one of twenty such surveys listed in an extensive article on higher education in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, January 21, 1961. No matter how good a report may be—how valid its statistical data, how worthy its recommendation—if it is placed on a shelf to gather dust, as often happens, it serves no useful purpose. Too often, after an initial reaction of consternation and alarm a community settles back into complacency from which it emerges only when disaster, in the form of consequences, overtakes it. That this did not happen in St. Louis was due to the leadership of the Committee on Higher Education, and its extensive efforts to keep the issue alive and before the people. "Higher education" was the topic of discussion at the annual meeting of the St. Louis White House Conference on Education, where the principal speaker was Dr. Dean McHenry (now chancellor of the University of California at Santa Cruz). The *St. Louis Post Dispatch* printed his address on the editorial page, and added its own, entitled "*First,* the Junior College." In November, the White House Conference, which had previously concerned itself only with elementary and secondary education, used the report as the topic and discussion for its 1960 biennial conference. Six hundred delegates—two-thirds laymen and one-third educators—endorsed its recommendations and urged implementation of the report.

Proposed legislation had now been drafted to provide for the needs of the St. Louis area. Meanwhile, the Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School had considered the recommendations and now endorsed them. The proposed legislation was rewritten to permit the establishment of a statewide system of junior colleges. By the time the legislature convened in January, 1961, the organization of a statewide committee to sponsor junior college legislation was well underway. This was just one year after publication of the recommendations.

A New Committee for the Next Step

The Missouri Citizens Committee for State Aid for Junior Colleges was initiated and sponsored by the Committee on Higher Educational Needs of Metropolitan St. Louis. Officers of the Missouri Committee represented labor, farmers, industry, business, education, and civic interests throughout the state. The names of some 7,000 citizens from all over Missouri were compiled as a mailing list for a *Bulletin* which was issued regularly throughout the legislative session. Its purpose was to inform the people of the exact status of the proposed junior college legislation, and to urge their support in the form of letters, wires, and telephone calls to their own legislative representatives in Jefferson City. When the bill was assigned to house or senate committees, special *Bulletins* were addressed to those whose representatives were members of the committees.

Early in January, members of the Missouri committee called together members of the legislature who were known to be interested in junior college legislation and urged them to combine their forces to support the bill as drafted by the committee. The bill was co-sponsored by a Republican from the urban area and a Democrat from rural Missouri, and was introduced early in February as House Bill 221.

H.B. 221 was assigned to the Education Committee and a hearing date was set. The Missouri committee, through its *Bulletin* and through its membership, organized attendance and arranged for key witnesses to speak on behalf of the bill. In order to accommodate the overflow crowd, the hearing was moved from a committee hearing room to the house chamber. Shortly after, the bill was revised—but not damaged—and reported out "do pass" as House Committee Substitute for H.B. 221.

Meanwhile, in the other legislative branch, junior college legislation in the form of Senate Bill 7 had been introduced, assigned to a "watchdog" committee and passed from there to the Senate Education Committee where it awaited a hearing. When it became apparent that the junior college bill coming from the house was imperiled, the contents of H.C.S. for H.B. 221 were virtually "lifted" and became Senate Committee Substitute for S.B. 7. It was the same proposal, with a different name.

It required all of the energies and resources of the Missouri committee—and its friends in the senate—to defeat a motion to send S.C.S. for S.B. 7 to a "deep freeze" committee (called the "deep freeze" committee because no bill requiring appropriations has as yet emerged from it for action). Still another move—to delete the provision for state aid—was defeated on the floor of the senate. After it went on the perfection calendar the bill had to be withdrawn for an important amendment. That the bill survived in spite of all these hazards was due largely to the interest and support which was forthcoming from the people.

There were many tense moments for committee members who recorded votes from the gallery—in both house and senate—as the bill proceeded toward enactment.

Through all of the panoply of parliamentary procedure, senatorial courtesy, and yes, sheer drama—there was a dominant lesson: *the people back home, and what they think, is very important to those who represent them.* On a first visit to discuss the merits of the bill with legislators, members of the Missouri committee were apt to be received rather casually. On the second, followup call, after an appeal through the *Bulletin* for letters, wires, and telephone calls, interest on the part of the same legislators was remarkably sharpened. They do care—they do listen to their constituents.

From a very shaky beginning, gaining strength with each newly weathered crisis, the bill emerged from the senate on June 7 by a vote of 19-7, and returned to the house. It carried a senate amendment, though essentially the same proposal passed by the house earlier, and it was again assigned to the House Education Committee.

Now began the "countdown" against time—for the session would end on June 30. A special warning *Bulletin* went out, asking people to urge the education committee to act quickly. On June 15, with fifteen days remaining (and not all of them working days), the committee sent out the bill "do pass." It took its place far down on an overloaded perfection calendar.

This was a frustrating, nerve-wracking period for members of the Missouri committee, who visited with those in a position to expedite passage of the bill, telephoned colleagues who might also bring influence to bear. It was a time, too, of sitting in the gallery, while precious hours sped away, listening to endless debate and argument (some of it important, some of it amusing, most of it dull) over bills fortunate enough to be ahead of S.C.S. for S.B. 7 on the calendar. (There was genuine envy of the resourcefulness and power of a wily senator whose "pet" bill was lifted—at the beginning of a late evening session—from its place far down on the calendar, and passed before unsuspecting stragglers answered the bell!) There was a real danger that the 1961 session would end before the bill could work its way to the top of the calendar.

The final drama took place on June 29, at 10 p.m., when the bill was called up for final action. Missouri's House of Representatives is much less staid than its senate. A great clanging of bells warns any representative, wherever he may be, that a vote is being taken. Votes are recorded on a large scoreboard which lights up with green lights for "Yes" and red for "No." No racetrack "tote board" was ever more carefully eyed than was the vote board in the house that night. Yet, in a singular tribute, attention from the floor was focused on the gallery, where Mrs. Aaron Fischer, the chairman of the

Missouri committee watched the voting and counted the green lights. It was a gratifying moment for her: the final tally was 131 "Yes" and 4 "No." The copy of S.C.S. for S.B. 7 which was used in final passage was autographed by legislators who had been influential in its passage, and presented to Mrs. Fischer in the gallery.

At five minutes before midnight on June 30, the omnibus appropriation bill (with $743,000 for junior colleges) was finally passed. Governor John M. Dalton signed the bill on July 25, to become effective on October 13, 1961.

The legislative struggle was over: Missouri had an excellent junior college law. And S.C.S. for S.B. 7 was now said to be the "most significant piece of legislation passed by the 1961 General Assembly!"

The 1961 act permitted the creation of junior college districts across school district or county lines; provided payment of $200 per student in full-time enrollment (based on 30 credit hours); vested authority for junior colleges in the State Department of Education; gave power to tax and bond for junior college purposes.

Clearly, the time had come to finally implement the committee's major recommendation: to create a junior college district for St. Louis-St. Louis County, Missouri.

The J.C.D. Committee

During the summer of 1961, following enactment of the law, still another committee was initiated and sponsored by the Committee on Higher Educational Needs—the Committee for the Junior College District of St. Louis-St. Louis County.

The law requires local initiative, in the form of signatures on petitions, as the first step in creating a new district. Signatures of 5 per cent of the number who voted in the last preceding election of school board directors must be obtained. The committee's first task was to organize a petition campaign by volunteers who circulated petitions in each school district.

Free office space was made available and funds contributed for part-time secretarial services. Information was mimeographed and given to a corps of volunteers who spoke before hundreds of organizations and groups throughout the area. Simultaneously the committee gathered data on students in the area so that the 1960 statistics could be updated for presentation to the State Board of Education.

Circulation of petitions began on the date the law became effective, October 13, and by November 15 the goal had been reached. Where 3,692 signatures were required in St. Louis County, 11,000 were turned in. Where 8,000 were needed in St. Louis City, 15,000 were turned in.

A Campaign for Votes

On November 29, 1961, petitions and the proposal for the creation of the J.C.D. were taken to Jefferson City and submitted to the commissioner of education. At a meeting of the state board on December 4, representatives of the J.C.D. Committee appeared to speak for the proposal. An opponent, who sought to set up a district in the county only, excluding the city, also appeared before the board. After careful study and deliberation the state board acted on January 5, 1962, to approve the proposal and set the election for April 3, 1962.

The most important factor in a successful campaign must be the many volunteers—those who give their time, energies, and minds to creating public interest and support. When no money was available for printing, and information sheets were desperately needed, these were mimeographed by member organizations. Later, when funds were at hand, the information was printed in an attractive brochure. (Copies are available.)

The proposal was supported editorially by both metropolitan newspapers—the *Post Dispatch* and the *Globe Democrat*—and both provided extensive coverage of news releases, as did the local radio and television stations. The issue was endorsed by many organizations and individuals of great strength, including the Labor Council, Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, P.T.A.'s, patron councils, teachers' associations, boards of education, heads of government of both city and county, and many, many others.

The important job of the J.C.D. committee was education—to inform people of the purpose of a good, public, junior college program, a form of higher education heretofore unknown in this area. The work of education begun in the campaign is still being carried on by the administrative staff and the board of trustees. Much more remains to be done.

Candidates for Board of Trustees

On the same day that the voters decided the issue—to create the district—they were to elect six trustees, two from the city and four from the county. A group of citizens, realizing the importance of a slate of qualified candidates, organized a committee to induce people to file. The citizens' committee for the trustees began to work in February, with the final filing date just a few weeks away. It was difficult to know whether *any* candidates would file for a new office, and whether any who did file would be committed to the best possible program for the district. The trustee committee, therefore, sought out qualified people in the area and after interviewing many, chose six who were endorsed as a slate.

The fears that no one would file for the office proved groundless. By the end of the filing period, there were candidates aplenty: seven from the city, which would elect two, and twenty-nine from the county, which would elect four! Those of us who were elected were impressed with the qualifications of many of the unsuccessful candidates who filed independently.

Organized Opposition to District

It is proper, perhaps, to insert an account of the organized opposition to the J.C.D. proposal. (The attempt of a small group to exclude the city and form a county district failed, as was recounted earlier.)

In 1961, while the bill was in the House Education Committee, the Citizens for Educational Freedom appeared in opposition to the proposal—the only opponents. Earlier, at the annual meeting of the White House Conference, a spokesman for the C.E.F. had publicly opposed the proposal. Briefly stated, the C.E.F. favored state grants to students to permit them to attend institutions of their choice. They contended it was "unconstitutional" to set up a public two-year college, since it deprived parent and student of the right of choice of the institution the student would attend.

The Citizens for Educational Freedom, as stated in its printed literature, is a national organization with headquarters in St. Louis. Its efforts to defeat the J.C.D. proposal included the distribution of leaflets in markets, churches, parking lots, etc. The printed leaflets, purporting to interpret the report of the Committee on Higher Education, contained inaccuracies and repeated the charge that the proposal was "unconstitutional."

When the J.C.D. committee learned that C.E.F. literature had been handed out at churches, markets, etc., it attempted to obtain permission to distribute its information brochures in the same places. In some instances permission was granted, in others it was not. Members of the C.E.F. appeared at public meetings where the J.C.D. issue was discussed, and advocated defeat of the proposal. The C.E.F. contacted radio and television stations early in the campaign, demanding equal time on the air for any time given to the J.C.D. committee.

A "rumor buster" sheet was prepared by the J.C.D. committee and furnished to all of its speakers, so that they could effectively answer the questions raised and the charges made by the C.E.F.

Election Eve — and the People Speak

In the closing days of the campaign, the J.C.D. committee redoubled its efforts to gain interest and support and to get out the vote. On April 2, a breakfast rally was organized to provide a forum for leaders in the community who strongly supported the issue. Statements of the community's most respected leaders were given excellent press and radio coverage.

Members of the J.C.D. committee spent the remaining hours making speeches, rounding up more volunteers who were needed to telephone and to work at the polls on election day. Volunteers handed out brochures, answered questions, telephoned, beginning at 6 a.m. on election day and staying with it until the polls closed at 7 p.m. Many county polling places were covered by volunteers every hour. Some, when relieved at one polling place, moved on to another which was not covered. The contribution made by this group of hard-working people was invaluable.

The period of waiting when the polls have closed is fraught with anxiety. Fortunately, it was a short period, for the first return from the city came from an area which is conservative, traditionally defeats public issues. The J.C.D. issue carried there, and by a substantial majority. The law required only a simple overall majority—and by 10 p.m. it was clear (even to those fearful of believing it) that the issue had carried.

The final tally showed a better than two-to-one majority.

The trustees elected were those whose candidacy had been endorsed by the citizens' committee.

The Community's College

Back in 1960, the Committee on Higher Education had said:

> *Every effort must be made to prevent the waste of the community's most important resources, its young men and women. The facts speak for themselves. The total cost of expansion of our educational facilities must be measured against costs of inadequate education. The consequences of too little and too late are social and economic instability. Neither this area nor the nation can afford such consequences.*

The vote was now in and the people had provided a framework through which could be provided two-year college programs so sorely needed. The next step was up to the trustees, who remember with gratitude the help which was forthcoming. The Danforth Foundation provided $3,000 immediately so that the lay board could seek professional consultation. Advice and free consultation was available from the American Association of Junior Colleges. Leland Medsker, a recognized junior college authority, provided great leadership. From across the nation professional educators were brought together to act as a screening committee as we sought a president for the district. When the board chose Joseph Cosand his professional colleagues added their persuasive arguments to those of the board to bring him to St. Louis. This community has welcomed him warmly and values him for his integrity, hard work, decisive action—and the excellent results he has achieved.

The Junior College in Missouri

Since the junior college law was enacted in 1961, three new area-wide districts have been formed in Missouri: St. Louis-St. Louis County, Newton-McDonald County, and Jefferson County. In addition, area-wide districts have been formed in communities where junior colleges formerly were operated as part of the high school districts. These are in Kansas City, Jasper County, St. Joseph, and the newest, Mineral Area (formerly Flat River). Only two junior colleges—Moberly and Trenton—continue to operate under the high school districts.

In the 1964-65 school year, the public junior colleges enrolled 14 per cent of all students enrolled in college in Missouri, both public and private, including the universities.

As the new districts began operations, it became apparent very soon that the junior college law must be revised to improve the formula for distribution of state funds. Briefly, the 1961 law provided for $200 per full-time student, equated on thirty credit hours, and paid on the previous year's enrollment. Newly created districts, which began classes in late afternoon and early evening, very quickly changed to daytime classes in either temporary buildings or rented facilities. This change resulted in rapid enrollment growth, and a serious deficit in state aid which was paid on the previous year's enrollment. The J.C.D. may be used as an example: Enrollment in February, 1963, 790; September, 1963, 2,400; September, 1964, 5,000. Consequently, in 1964 the J.C.D. received only 8.9 per cent of its operating costs from the state. In the state as a whole, state aid amounted to 18 per cent of operating costs.

The Missouri Association of Junior Colleges, aware of the weakness in the law, initiated and sponsored a bill to amend it and correct the inequities. Members of its legislative committee distributed a bulletin, worked closely with key legislators, appeared before legislative hearings. H.B. 339 was enacted late in the session and the votes by which it passed both houses is significant. The house voted 141 "Yes" and ten "No." The senate voted twenty-six "Yes" and no vote was cast against it. There was a new attitude of interest and friendliness on the part of key legislators.

H.B. 339 provides an increase in state aid to $240 per full-time student, equated on twenty-four credit hours, and paid on current enrollment. This amounts to approximately 50 per cent increase in state aid.

Missouri's new Commission on Higher Education is hard at work on a coordinated plan for higher education. Hopefully, the role of each segment of higher education will be more clearly defined. Missouri's new governor is young and energetic Warren E. Hearnes, who has long been known as a friend of education. With the resources and great prestige of his office, with attention focused on the needs of education at all levels, there is great hope that Missouri may move ahead.

What Role for the Community College?

Much space has been devoted here to legislation, community support, and building needs. Perhaps in closing some thought might be given to the purpose of the community college. Simply stated, a community college should not be inflexible. Its programs should meet the needs of the community as those needs grow and as they change. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., called it "democracy's college of the century"—and it is.

Today's comprehensive community college should serve the needs of its youth for higher education and for self-fulfillment. It should provide programs for adults, for enrichment of lives, for job advancement, for retraining when job skills have become outmoded. More than any other institution, it belongs uniquely to the people. It should be administered in such a way that it will be a source of pride to the community which supports it and to the students who attend its classes.

In a letter to a friend in 1818, Thomas Jefferson unknowingly defined the comprehensive community college of the future. At the same time, he gave good advice for those who, as board members and administrators, share the responsibility for its programs:

> *A system of general instruction which shall reach every description of our citizens from the richest to the poorest, as it was the earliest, so it will be the latest of all public concerns in which I shall permit myself to take an interest. Nor am I tenacious of the form in which it shall be introduced. Be that what it may, our descendants will be as wise as we are, and will know how to amend and amend it, until it shall suit their circumstances. Give it to us then, in any shape, and receive for the inestimable boon the thanks of the young and the blessings of the old who are past all other services but prayers for the prosperity of their country, and blessings for those who promote it.*

Progress in Maryland

By Frank B. Pesci and Robert T. Novak

18

Maryland is one of the states advancing toward the goal of locating a community college within reach of every citizen. This trend, which is changing the entire picture of higher education in the state, is the result of leadership provided by gubernatorial commissions, the state legislature, the efforts of local civic groups and boards of education, the State Department of Education, and the recently created Advisory Council for Higher Education.

Maryland has had public junior colleges since 1927 when a state-supported institution was incorporated in what is now St. Mary's College of Maryland.[1] The idea of community junior colleges first appeared in the 1931 Shriver Commission report, which envisioned state-aided colleges "relieving the state university of some of the students in the freshman and sophomore years."[2] In 1935 the State Board of Education endorsed a plan establishing junior college divisions of the normal schools (now state colleges) at Frostburg and Salisbury.[3]

The story of Maryland's community colleges began in 1939 when the state legislature, recognizing a trend toward education beyond secondary school, created the Maryland State School Survey Commission. Up to this time Maryland had no standards for the accreditation of junior colleges although three institutions were in existence. With leadership provided by the State Department of Education, standards were adopted late in 1939.[4] According to the 1939 standards, the State Department of Education would consider for accreditation as a junior college any local, nonprofit institution which offered at least one two-year curriculum to which admission was limited to high school graduates.[5]

In its report, the Maryland State School Survey Commission encouraged the expansion in Baltimore City of "one or more of the secondary schools to include the junior college years." [6]

In 1945 the Maryland Commission on Higher Education, created by legislative enactment, contracted with the American Council on Education to conduct a survey of higher education, including a special study of the junior college situation. Establishment of a statewide system of locally controlled junior college units was first on the list of recommendations made by the so-called Marbury Commission, which was submitted to Governor Herbert R. O'Conor early in 1947.[7] As a result of the special study which was conducted by Koos,[8] it was decided that sixteen of Maryland's twenty-three counties could have at least one junior college, and four counties could combine to establish two institutions. The survey suggested three or four junior colleges for Baltimore City.[9] The Commission also recommended establishment of a permanent State Board of Higher Education which would assist in the development of locally controlled junior colleges.[10]

Meanwhile, the return of veterans seeking the advantages of higher education following World War II brought about the establishment of two locally controlled institutions in 1946: Montgomery Junior College, and Hagerstown Junior College.[11] Baltimore Junior College was begun in 1947 as an extension of the Veterans Institute, which was a temporary organization to provide high school courses for World War II veterans.[12]

In 1955 the Governor's Commission to Study the Needs of Higher Education in Maryland recommended that the establishment of community colleges be the first step in "meeting the demands that cannot be met by expanding existing institutions." [13] In addition, the commission suggested that "semi-technical courses be developed and sponsored by community junior colleges as a part of the higher education program of the State." [14]

Four community colleges were established in

1957: Catonsville Community College and Essex Community College in Baltimore County, Frederick Community College, and Harford Junior College. Prince George's Community College and Charles County Community College were begun the following year.[15]

The State Department of Education, at the request of the Allegany County delegation to the 1957 General Assembly, conducted a study of the needs of higher education in western Maryland and recommended the establishment of a community college at Cumberland.[16] As a result of the survey, Allegany Community College began operation in 1961. Anne Arundel Community College came into existence that same year.[17]

In 1959 the department, at the request of officials from a four-county area on the Eastern Shore, prepared a study on the feasibility of establishing a community college to service the area. It was recommended that two community colleges, at Easton and Cambridge, be established.[18] To date no action has been taken on the recommendation. However, in 1965 the General Assembly passed legislation which permits the State Board of Education to establish regional community colleges for two or more counties.[19] The state legislature also passed a companion measure which provides a $5 million fund for the construction of regional community colleges.[20] This means that two or more counties may operate a community college cooperatively and may apply for 75 per cent of construction costs from the fund.

The Maryland State Board of Education, in its 1960 report, recommended that the state "pledge itself to vigorous support of existing community junior colleges" and "that the state grant substantial assistance in establishing additional junior colleges where they are needed and in accordance with an overall state plan approved by the board." [21]

Finally, in 1961 the General Assembly adopted a resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission by Governor J. Millard Tawes, who charged it with the task of formulating a plan of organization for the entire system of public higher education in Maryland.[22] The commission recommended that a Division of Higher Education within the State Department of Education be established so that the department could better exercise its responsibilities to community colleges.[23] Furthermore, the commission indicated that the community colleges should provide programs for transfer students and "other students who need a two-year terminal program with training in general and technical education." [24]

Legislation

An examination of the laws of the State of Maryland by Koos [25] and DeCicco [26] for authority to establish and maintain junior colleges found no specific reference to them by name. There was, however, a section providing for "a general program of continuing education" [27] which was interpreted as giving this authority to local boards of education.

Although not passing any specific legislation, the General Assembly in 1947 included in the public school budget $60,000 for community colleges. In 1949, again without legislative action, the General Assembly increased its appropriation to community colleges to $100 per equivalent full-time student, or $116,000.[28] Subsequently, the amount of state aid to community colleges was increased to $125, $150, $175, and $225 per equivalent full-time student.[29,30] Beginning July 1, 1966, the state's contribution toward operating expenses at community colleges will be increased to $300 per equivalent full-time student.[31]

After over a decade of operating community colleges on the strength of a law providing for a program of continuing education, the General Assembly passed two significant pieces of legislation in 1961. One statute legalized the creation of community colleges by authorizing local boards of education to establish these institutions which would be financed by the state, by the sponsoring political subdivisions, and by student fees.[32] The second law authorized the issuance of bonds totaling $5 million for the construction of community colleges.[33]

In 1962, the General Assembly provided an additional $5 million for construction, to be matched by the local school systems.[34] Two years later the state legislature provided for the issuance of $15 million in bonds to be distributed to subdivisions for the acquisition of sites and construction of community colleges.[35] In 1965, the General Assembly amended the 1962 and 1964 acts which provided construction funds on a matching basis.[36] The 1965 act provides that state grants be made at a rate equal to the percentage of state aid a school system receives under the public education current expense formula, or at 50 per cent, whichever amount is greater. This introduces an equalization element and will greatly assist rural counties with community college construction projects.

In 1963 the General Assembly enacted a plan which was an outgrowth of the 1962 report to reorganize and expand public higher education in Maryland. The legislation [37] established the Advisory Council for Higher Education to guide the growth of all higher education. Prior to final passage, a provision for an assistant state superintendent of schools to supervise a division of higher education in the Department of Education was stricken from the original bill.

The authorization by the state legislature to create a $30 million debt for community college construction has given great impetus to local boards of trustees for planning separate college facilities. Today, six community colleges in Maryland are operating in separate facilities. Four are operating entirely in local high schools. Plans for separate facilities, however, are underway for these institutions. A recent survey revealed that four of the community colleges are in the plant planning stage, two are expanding their campuses, two are building new campuses, and one is completing a second campus.

During the 1964 fall semester, Maryland's eleven public community colleges enrolled 10,939 full- and part-time students, an increase of 39 per cent over a period of two years.[38]

The degree programs offered in Maryland's community colleges are designed for both college transfer and occupational education. Four basic transfer curriculums are offered in all eleven community colleges: arts and sciences, business administration, engineering, and teacher education. Some institutions also offer transfer programs in agriculture, art, communications, general studies, home economics, international affairs, medical technology, and music.

The occupational curriculums offered at the community colleges vary considerably. Local needs are the primary basis for establishing these programs. Some examples of these occupational curriculums, taken from 1965-1966 bulletins, are accounting, business, chemical technology, construction technology, data processing, dental assisting, electronics technology, engineering technology, laboratory technology, law enforcement, mechanical technology, medical secretarial, nursing, radiation technology, secretarial studies, and urban development assistant.

It is significant to note that all of the community colleges offer at least one occupational curriculum. As these institutions continue to move into separate facilities and as community surveys are conducted, the number and kind of occupational programs undoubtedly will increase.

Prospects

Eleven sites have been identified by the State Department of Education as having enrollment potential, with five of these in counties already having community college programs.[39] Plans in various stages of development are underway for the establishment of new community colleges on the Eastern Shore and in Carroll County.[40]

Two recent events may have a profound effect on the future development of community colleges in Maryland. A piece of local legislation was introduced near the end of the 1965 session of the General Assembly. The measure, sponsored by delegates from Prince George's County, would have established a separate governing board for Prince George's Community College, replacing the local board of education.[41] The bill was referred to the House Education Committee and later referred to the Advisory Council for Higher Education for study.

Speaking at the 1965 commencement at Charles County Community College, Maryland's Congressman-at-large Carlton R. Sickles called for a study to determine the feasibility of public financial support for two years of tuition-free education in the state's community colleges.

The prospect for continued development of Maryland's community colleges is indeed bright. The establishment of new campuses and the increase in state aid attest to this bright future. Indeed, the General Assembly, the governor, the State Department of Education, and the State Board of Education all favor and firmly believe in community college education. With this impetus and the continued support of the people, the community college movement in Maryland can do nothing less than flourish.

---

[1] Pullen, Thomas G. Jr. "History of the Development of Public Community and Junior Colleges in Maryland: Steps Ahead." Speech given at annual summer meeting, State Association of County Commissioners of Maryland, Ocean City, August 26, 1961, p. 6.

[2] Maryland Commission on Higher Education, *Report to Governor and General Assembly*, January 1931, p. 23.

[3] Maryland State Department of Education, "A Decade of Progress in Education in Maryland: 1949-1959," *Maryland School Bulletin* 28, October 1961, p. 61.

[4] Wilson, Theodore H. "New Standards in Maryland," *Junior College Journal* 10, May 1940, p. 582.

[5] Maryland State Department of Education, *Maryland Standards for Non-Public Schools: Junior Colleges*, 1939, p. 1.

[6] *The 1941 Survey of the Maryland Public Schools and Teachers Colleges.* Baltimore: Maryland State School Survey Commission, 1941, p. 401.

[7] *Higher Education in Maryland.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947, p. 352.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 290-295.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 302-304.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 378-380.

[11] Pesci, Frank B. "The Junior College Movement in Maryland: 1939-1962," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1963, pp. 12-13.

[12] Whitney, Herbert Chester. "The Origin and Development of Baltimore Junior College," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1949, p. 86.

[13] *The Needs of Higher Education in Maryland,* Report of the Commission to Study the Needs of Higher Education in Maryland, 1955, p. 100.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 101.

[15] Pesci, Frank B. *op. cit.,* p. 14.

[16] Maryland State Department of Education, "A Decade of Progress in Education in Maryland: 1949-1959," *op. cit.,* p. 64.

[17] Pesci, Frank B. *op. cit.*

[18] "Eastern Shore Study," report prepared by the Maryland State Department of Education, April 1959, p. 23.

[19] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1965, Senate Bill No. 419.

[20] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1965, Senate Bill No. 420.

[21] Maryland State Board of Education, *A Program for Progress in Higher Education in Maryland,* May 1960.

[22] *Public Higher Education in Maryland: 1961-1975,* The Report of the Commission for the Expansion of Public Higher Education in Maryland, Baltimore, June 1962, p. 6.

[23] *Ibid.,* p. 47.

[24] *Ibid.,* p. 40.

[25] Koos, Leonard V. "A Junior College Plan for Maryland," *School Review,* vol. LV, June 1947, p. 336.

[26] DeCicco, John. "A Critical Analysis of Community College Legislation," unpublished M.A. thesis, The Catholic University of America, 1952, p. 24.

[27] *Annotated Code of Maryland,* 1939 edition, Article 77, sec. 41a.

[28] Martorana, S. V. "Recent State Legislation Affecting Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal* 20, January 1950, p. 250.

[29] Pullen, Thomas G. Jr., *op. cit.,* pp. 9 f.

[30] *Annotated Code of Maryland,* 1961 supplement, Article 77, sec. 304b.

[31] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1965, House Bill No. 245.

[32] *Acts of 1961, General Assembly of Maryland,* c. 134.

[33] *Acts of 1961, General Assembly of Maryland,* c. 373.

[34] *Acts of 1962, General Assembly of Maryland,* c. 22.

[35] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1964, Senate Bill No. 132.

[36] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1965, Senate Bill

No. 634.

[37] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1963, Senate Bill No. 9.

[38] *Junior College Directory.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965, p. 10.

[39] *Public Higher Education in Maryland: 1961-1975, op. cit.,* p. 37.

[40] *The Washington Post,* June 30, 1965, p. B10.

[41] *General Assembly of Maryland,* 1965, House Bill No. 981.

The Explosion in Arizona

By Robert J. Hannelly

Pinal, Cochise, Graham, Tombstone, Yuma, Maricopa, Grand Canyon, and Barry Goldwater. With which great state are these names associated? Well, we want to tell you about the phenomenal activity in the junior college business 'way out here in Arizona, pardner.

We'll start with Maricopa County because that's where we work.

Consider the drama of change from the fall of 1962 to the fall of 1963. We are talking, of course, about the junior college in Phoenix and Maricopa County. The full-time day faculty went from 120 to 180 teachers. Likewise, the student enrollment from 8,000 to 12,000, head count. The "footsie"—i.e. F.T.S.E., or full-time-student-equivalent—went from 5,000 to 6,400. The district of 150 square miles embracing Phoenix was changed to include all of Maricopa County with an area four square miles less than Vermont. The population to be served increased from 500,000 to 800,000.

All of this without buying any new land or building additional buildings. How, then? Simply by expending almost $300,000 for rent and by purchasing a few portable classrooms. Rented units full- or part-time include the present Phoenix College plant; fifteen rooms at Temple Beth Israel; a former church community center with Olympic-size swimming pool; an insurance building which was formerly an L.D.S. church; and the plush new Jewish Community Center. The extension farthest from the main campus is sixteen miles away.

The budget was hiked from $1,800,000 to over $5 million. Disproportionate, did we hear you say? Ah, but about $2.5 million of the $5 million is for capital outlay and for rent! This latter is necessary since for the last few years Phoenix College has been run on an austerity basis in capital outlay. The present plan is to acquire a site and build one-third to one-half of a complete additional junior college within the fiscal year.

How can all of this happen?

First, because of the overwhelming approval of county electors at the polls to the tune of 90,000 to 40,000. Imagine, 130,000 votes on the incorporation of a junior college district. Is this a record? To get so many it's necessary to make the date coincide with the general political election.

Second, because of the blue-ribbon board. The members include Mr. Robert M. Jaap, vice-president of the First National Bank with seventy branches; Dr. C. Lester Hogan, vice-president and general manager of Motorola, Inc., which spends $50 million dollars in the county; Mr. W. J. Miller, treasurer of the Del Webb Corporation, which builds million-dollar structures over the entire Southwest; Mr. Dwight Patterson, operator of a multi-million dollar cattle and agricultural spread; Dr. Robert F. Easley, well-known head physician of a local hospital.

In the third place, because of realistic state subsidy. The state pays $525 for each of the first 320 students and $350 for each over 320. This is for operation and maintenance. In addition it pays $115 per capita per year for capital outlay which is cumulative. Wait, that's not all! The state will match the original capital outlay up to $500,000, e.g., if the district builds a building costing $800,000, the state pays $400,000. If it builds one costing $1,200,000, the state pays $500,000. You may ask, "Who pays the rest?" The county. The state and Maricopa County share the entire cost about fifty-fifty.

All In Four Months

We hope that the reader has shared our excitement so far. If the reader happens to be a junior college administrator, he may share more fully some of the details in his department. Perhaps we were not accurate to indicate at the beginning that cataclysmic change took place in a year. Actually the administrative work was accomplished in about four months from May 1 to September 1. Most of it took place between July 1 and September 1, since the district began operation July 1.

In the months of May and June we hired additional personnel on a conditional basis, executed conditional lease contracts for facilities, and prepared a tentative budget. All these steps became legal on July 1. During the period from December 1 to the present the county board has met weekly for three hours. The administrative staff carried a 30 per cent overload during that period. Their vacations were curtailed or postponed to get facilities and programs ready by September 9, opening date.

One of the thorny personnel problems was to move a teacher who had taught for years at the main diggings to toil in the garden at an extension. However, the administration had to be firm, since it had promised the extension students and their parents that the same high standard for faculty would be maintained out there. This standard is, as a minimum, the master's degree and sixty semester hours in the subject taught. Also, we promised that the extensions would not be staffed entirely by new teachers. Thus, we had to twist a few arms, although some old hands were glad to change.

Books for the library? Now there's a job. The board allocated $75,000 for new acquisitions. This required the library staff to work all summer.

Dr. Robert Sullivan, associate secretary for the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association, assured us that our previous accreditation status covers the extensions. For this we are grateful, because high school graduates ask frequently about accreditation.

Our problems in payroll, student accounting, budget, and inventory control will be solved by an I.B.M. 1620 and other machines.

At extensions we have an administrative dean who is jack-of-all-trades including instruction, student affairs, faculty affairs, counseling, and discipline. Dr. John D. Riggs and Dean J. Lee Thompson will change from our main campus to direct extensions. During June, the administrators spent lunch hours nailing screens, repairing doors, watering trees, and swimming at the extensions. Although we were not to acquire control until July 1, we determined to prevent vandalism and deterioration, without funds. Imagine a dean ordering teenage boys, probable future students, to get out of the pool and off the property while he stood there with his swim trunks under his arm. Fun and inconsistency!

Some Setbacks

Unsolved problems at the extensions are physical education programs, athletic eligibility, and food service. At one extension there is a snack bar, cafeteria, pool, tennis courts, and health club. Another has snack bar, pool, and gymnasium. A third has none of these. Perhaps, for these students, Joe's Hamburger Stand down the street, the high school gymnasium a mile away, and the golf driving range across the street will suffice. The physical education teachers will have to play by ear, emphasize carry-over sports, and learn to use community facilities. Since the extensions will not have football, should an ace player living in the extension be allowed to strengthen the team at the main campus? Yes, indeed, but how about basketball?

A setback which spread gloom throughout the junior college personnel was the failure of a $9,750,000 bond election on May 7. Passage would have resulted in three brand-new junior colleges in 1965. The electors, by their negative vote, were protesting higher taxes for all schools and colleges. They indicated that the new district should learn to crawl before walking. The shock was probably good for the junior college management. A bond election for a lesser amount was held before July 1, 1964. Much explanation and interpretation of the advantage of junior college education to the youth and to the community was necessary beforehand. The district, despite the first setback, was not without funds. Substantial capital funds were available outside of bonds, as were operational funds. We had to reach in the drawer and pull out Plan II.

In Other Counties

By no means is junior college expansion in Arizona restricted to Maricopa County. Eastern Arizona Junior College changed over to a state-county college for Graham County. President Paul Guitteau has completed building classrooms, gymnasium, stadium, and other facilities to serve 800 students.

Arizona Western College, serving Yuma County, opened in 1963, under the direction of President John Barnes, to serve 350 students.

President William Harwood is directing the building of Cochise College in the county of the same name. It opened for 320 students in 1964.

Pinal County has a board and will build on a new location this year.

Arizona is unique in having a seventeen-man state board of directors for junior colleges, consisting of one representative for each of the fourteen counties, appointed by the governor, the state superintendent of public instruction, the state superintendent of vocational education, and a representative from the board of regents. Dr. George A. Spikes serves ably as chairman. Dr. John F. Prince, an experienced and able junior college administrator, renders invaluable service as executive director for the state board.

The 1960 Arizona Law

The evolution of the junior college law of 1960 warrants attention. Due to the maze of conflicting requests from various counties, the legislature provided for the appointment of a study-survey committee to consider the problem of post-high school education. This group consisted of six legislators and six educators. Wisely, it provided $30,000 for expenses. Dr. Frank B. Lindsay of California wrote the report, the main features of which were written into the law.

The main features of the law are the independent state board for junior colleges and the capital outlay provision of $115 per student per year. The state board controls curriculum, locations of colleges, and titles to property. The county boards choose and employ personnel and make the budget. A county or combination of contiguous counties must have a minimum of $60 million of assessed value and a potential student body of 320 or more students before it can become a district which participates fully in state funds.

In 1960 only ten persons in Arizona served on junior college boards, but now there are forty-two.

The people in Arizona no longer confuse the junior college with the junior high school or the junior chamber of commerce. They know it is different from the high school and the university. They still need to learn more about the opportunities of its comparatively low cost and its propinquity. Furthermore, they need to understand that better post-high school education raises cultural and business levels of communities and that it is an investment in youth comparable to investment in other fabulous developments in the fabulous state of Arizona.

The Oregon Story

By Don P. Pence

Although the history of the comprehensive community college movement in Oregon up to 1961 is, to a great extent, the history of Central Oregon College, no institution is an island, and many forces and influences made their contributions to the historical development of the Oregon movement.

Central Oregon College, located at Bend, Oregon, enrolled its first class in September, 1949, and with the exception of the 1949-50 academic year, during which time it shared its existence, including staff, with a similar attempt at Klamath Falls, the college at Bend pioneered the Oregon movement for thirteen years. An attempt was also made at Baker, Oregon, in 1949, but the operation only lasted for one term. The Klamath Falls program also closed after one academic term, and the faculty of three full-time professors who had commuted every other day between Bend and Klamath Falls, a distance then of 140 miles, were employed by the Bend district alone for the 1950-51 academic year. Until 1964 Central Oregon College was an evening school only, using the facilities of the Bend public schools.

Oregon is often referred to as the "last frontier," and for many good reasons. The state has not developed as rapidly as her neighbors—Washington, to the north, and California, to the south. Until the last decade, most of Oregon's population was concentrated in the Willamette Valley, and with most of that in the Portland area. Population concentration outside this area was not sufficient to force development of post-high school institutions. State support for public schools was slow in coming to Oregon where the people, until recently, took great pride in local autonomy and would rather go without than be dependent upon state and federal participation. Oregon was progressive, however, in establishing a coordinated state system of higher education in the early thirties, but until 1960 these institutions were not overcrowded and so did not lend real support to a state system of two-year colleges. The four-year schools were ambitious for their own growth and feared the further division of the tax dollar.

This is not to say Oregon has been without its proponents for the two-year college, both public and private, including the vocational type of school, as well as the junior college or liberal arts type. As early as 1884 the Y.M.C.A. in Portland developed an evening school which was later organized as a two-year, nonprofit educational institution (1946), under the name of "Multnomah College."

Legislators in Oregon were undoubtedly looking across the border to California when, in 1925, legislation was introduced to permit the establishment of a public junior college in a district with a high school enrollment of 300 students and an assessed valuation of $4,000,000. The bill failed to pass, which was probably good, for the minimum conditions were somewhat inadequate. In 1927, Senator Roberts of The Dalles, Oregon, introduced a bill providing for the establishment of junior colleges. He would have divided the state into thirteen junior college districts and had them formed by a vote of the people in the district. The 1927 "Roberts Bill" was, in the estimation of the writer, a good bill, but it failed to pass.

Undoubtedly, the great depression of the early thirties forestalled any further attempt by the state or local districts until 1938.

Menegat, in his *History of Trade and Industrial Education in Oregon,* states that "in February, 1938, the first area vocational school in Oregon was formed at Eugene." He lists the Oregon Vocational School (now Oregon Technical Institute) as number two, starting on July 14, 1947, and Oregon City Vocational School as number three, opening in 1949. These three schools were of a public nature designed to serve post-high school youth during the first half of the twentieth century. Their programs were primarily of the trade and industrial type and remained so for several years; however, within the last few years the three have taken different courses.

Central Oregon College enrolled its first class in 1949 and operated under a statute commonly known as the "Dunn Bill," passed by the 1949 Legislative Assembly. This was a very simple statute which provided that a public school district could enter into a contract with the General Extension Division of the State System of Higher Education to provide lower division collegiate courses in the local district, and that the school board might provide funds in the regular budget for support of such classes to be supervised by the General Extension Division. Obviously, this was the extension-type, two-year college, with local financial support guaranteed to the state system of higher education.

The Eugene school came within the financial framework of the "community college" law in 1961, and was operated until June, 1965, by the Eugene school system as a technical-vocational school. On October 19, 1964, the Lane County Area Education District was approved by a vote of the people to establish a comprehensive community college for the area. By statute, the Eugene Technical-Vocational School will now discontinue, and the new "area district" will take over its function.

When pressures begin to be exerted on legislatures, the customary thing to do is to study the "problem" and report back next session, and/or hire a "specialist" from some distance away and pay him to study the "problem" and make recommendations. How welcome the specialist will be in the state after his report is printed and distributed depends upon the degree to which the report agrees with the majority opinion as preconceived. As disturbing as the lack of immediate implementation of such studies and reports may be, the writer has learned in eleven years of experience in working on legislation and with legislators, that persistence, with patience and understanding, will bring results.

The 1949 legislative session called Dr. Leonard

V. Koos to study the situation, and the results were published in 1950 in his *A Community College Plan for Oregon.* Although the writer disagreed vigorously with the Koos philosophy of the "integrated" type of college, under the same board of control that has grades one through twelve, the argument is purely academic, for the resultant law passed by the 1951 Legislative Assembly had a far more significant weakness as far as the people were concerned. That weakness was a lack of realistic participation by the state in the financing of junior colleges. The law was never used.

In 1955, an attempt was made to implement the "Dunn Bill," under which Central Oregon College operated, as an "extension" type of community college. The proposed legislation would have provided $100 per full-time student equivalent to be paid by the state. The legislation failed after heavy last-minute lobbying by the state system of higher education. Although the legislation was killed in the Senate Committee on Education, after having passed the House of Representatives by a three-to-one majority, the near-success did bring forth another interim study committee, this time set up by joint action of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education.

This resultant legislation was a community law to replace the unused Koos-inspired junior college law. The 1957 law provided $150 per full-time student (based on twelve hours per term), or a theoretical 25 per cent of operating costs. Central Oregon College came under the provision of this law, beginning July 1, 1957, by a vote of the local district electorate, and severed connection with the General Extension Division. One rather unusual feature, characteristic of "extension" type programs, was the inclusion in the new community college law of a provision that all transfer courses, and the instructors teaching such courses, must be approved by the state system of higher education; the idea being to provide a built-in approval system to facilitate the transfer of credits to the senior institutions. This provision has been carried along in subsequent legislation, and is probably unique. The approval system ends when the community college becomes accredited by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

The 1959 session set up two parallel interim studies on vocational education: one by Dr. W. R. Flesher of Ohio State University, and the other a legislative interim committee. Unfortunately, there was little communication between the two study groups, nor any real attempt to coordinate or make a comparative analysis of the two separate studies. Although the studies were conducted separately, there were certain areas of agreement. Among these was the concept of the "service" area and administrative district being one and the same. With the exception of the large Portland metropolitan area, the administrative districts for post-high school education were envisioned as larger than existing public school districts and were essentially viewed as superimposed districts for college purposes, covering the natural geographic and service areas of the state.

Working Toward New Legislation

Although two bills were introduced representing the thinking of each interim study, the resultant compromise was, in the opinion of the writer, basically sound in principle. However, it turned out to be rather unwieldly from a mechanical standpoint, in creating area districts through a vote of individual school districts within the area (something that was corrected by the 1961 legislature). The concept of area districts as a more desirable administrative framework than community colleges being created within unified school districts in a fourteen-year system, was now mandatory—except in one instance, Portland, a city of over 100,000 population. The financial support pattern moved up to $200 per full-time student equivalent (based on twelve hours per term). In theory, this formula was based on the concept of one-third state, one-third student tuition, and one-third local tax, on an assumed $600 per year per student cost for operational expenses. No money was envisioned for buildings. A bill to have the state assume 50 per cent of operational costs and 50 per cent of building costs failed in committee.

The important gains in 1959 were: (1) the comprehensive concept in program by including vocational, adult, lower-division collegiate, and guidance services in a single framework, and (2) the "area education district" under a separate board of education.

Although this concept was formulated for future community colleges and area vocational schools under local district control, the legislature disregarded the recommendation of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education, as well as the recommendation contained in the *Flesher Report* on the subject of "Oregon Technical Institute" (then entirely under the State Board of Education), and transferred its control to the State Board of Higher Education.

With the exception of Central Oregon College, which moved from old to new statute under the usual "grandfather clause," no other college was formed to come within the statute. There were three basic reasons: (1) the mechanics of formation, through consolidation of territory contained in existing school districts, created the possibility of a checkerboard arrangement; (2) it did not provide for zoning within a college area district to guarantee board representation for each community within the area district; and (3) the state financial participation was still inadequate.

The Coos Bay-North Bend area attempted to form but ended in litigation which lasted through the biennium. Although during the 1950-60 decade great strides were made by individual unified school districts in Oregon, operating in cooperation with the State Division of Vocational Education in developing vocational programs at the post-high school level, none of them actually formed under the area district statute until after the close of the 1961 session, which further implemented the area district law mechanically, but, more significantly, provided for the first time in the long history of this struggle a realistic formula of state participation.

Central Oregon College, like all pioneers, was blazing a trail for others who might follow. The writer has a feeling of gratitude to society for the opportunity of being involved in such a worthy pioneering movement. The involvement gave the writer a supreme challenge, as well as an opportunity to further his own education while assisting in the promotion of the movement. Working cooperatively with the State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the Oregon State University School of Education under Dean Franklin R. Zeran, the writer developed his doctoral dissertation, *Criteria for a System of Area Education Districts for the State of Oregon (1960)*, as a guideline for further implementation of the movement.

The writer's major professor on the dissertation was Dr. Wendell L. Van Loan, who later became the first president of Southwestern Oregon College at Coos Bay, the first area district college to be formed under the new 1961 statute.

It must, then, be said that, although Central Oregon College was the only institution operating as a community college prior to 1961, representatives of the State Department of Education, particularly Mr. Oscar I. Paulson, then state director of vocational education, Mr. William G. Loomis, supervisor of trade and industrial education, and Mr. Paul Wilmeth, president of the Oregon Vocational Association, as well as other educators and interested citizens in the various communities, worked along with representatives of Central Oregon College, including Dr. Orde S. Pinckney, now dean of the faculty; Mr. Robert S. Johnson, director of continuing education; and members of the legislature to bring to fruition the 1961 law. Its basic concept remains fundamental to our present statute.

Special recognition must go to Mr. Henry H. Hansen of North Bend, who worked diligently and effectively in bringing into existence the present Southwestern Oregon College, and who served as chairman of its first board of education. Mr. Hansen was chairman of the local Longshoremen's Committee on Education and, later, chairman of the local community college study committee. He worked with the writer as an unpaid lobbyist during the 1957 and 1959 sessions, and is one of an originally small group of civic-minded citizens in various communities throughout Oregon who took a particular interest in the early phases of the movement. Among these are such names as Dr. E. G. Palmrose, an Astoria physician; J. Richard Gerttula, a Clatsop County dairyman; Dr. John Easly, an Ontario dentist; and William E. Miller, a Bend businessman and current chairman of the Central Oregon College board. These few citizens are but representative of the many civic leaders and legislators throughout Oregon who, over the years, were determined to see the movement through to its logical conclusion. During the fifties the movement was held together by an occasional meeting of interested persons, at some central point, to coordinate efforts. Our true reward came in the realistic legislation of the 1961 session and the college formations that followed.

With passage of the 1961 statute and its acceptable financial pattern, the movement became a reality. (The state was committed to pay $433 per F.T.E. on operational costs and 75 per cent of building construction costs). The writer feels that the delay, in spite of earlier frustrations, probably accounts for the healthy condition of Oregon community colleges today. Oregon, by waiting and developing far-sighted legislation, has been able to avoid the dilemma in which some of the other states find themselves. For example, nine of the present eleven community colleges in Oregon are comprehensive in nature (only the Salem and Oregon City schools are exclusively technical-vocational), and eight of the eleven are set up on an "area district" basis. (Portland, Salem, and Oregon City are under unified districts.) Recent studies have recommended that these also be re-formed on a "service" area basis, with a separate board.

Southwestern Oregon College, North Bend-Coos Bay, was established on May 15, 1961 (Wendell L. Van Loan, president); Treasure Valley College, Ontario, was established on October 19, 1961 (Eugene F. Voris, president); Clatsop College, Astoria, was established on February 14, 1962 (Richard D. Boss, president); Central Oregon College, Bend, was reestablished on an area basis on February 14, 1962 (Don P. Pence, president); Blue Mountain College, Pendleton, was established on. June 11, 1962 (Wallace W. McCrae, president); Umpqua College, Roseburg, was established on March 30, 1964 (Harry Jacoby, president); and Mt. Hood College (area northeast of Portland) was established on June 3, 1965.

Currently, the area around The Dalles (Mid-Columbia district) is preparing to vote on the formation of an "area district," and an area around Albany (Linn-Benton counties) is discussing possible formation. Two additional areas have attempted formation and failed: one southeast of Portland in the Milwaukee-Oregon City area failed on May 18, 1962; and the other just west of Portland in the Beaverton area (Washington County), failed quite recently (April 22, 1965). The chief argument against the Beaverton attempt was its close proximity to the proposed new Portland Community College westside campus location on Mt. Sylvania.

One of the first acts during the 1961-63 biennium of the group of then eight colleges was to form a state association of community colleges. Again, trying to take advantage of the most progressive thinking and far-looking developments in other states, the group met and studied the constitutions and organizational patterns of similar organizations in other states. The result was something more comprehensive in nature than seems the usual pattern. An initial meeting was held in May, 1962, with Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Dr. Thomas B. Merson of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and Dr. Henry T. Tyler of the California Junior College Association, present as consultants. This, along with later organizational meetings, eventually led to the formation of a state association with four basic organizations underpinning it: a section for the chief administrative officers, a section for members of boards of education, a section for faculty and other staff, and a sponsored, but independent, section for students. The officers of the first three sections elect the presiding officers for the overall state association.

The association held its first annual conference at Clatsop College, May 10-11, 1963, emphasizing its concern with academic matters by holding two general sessions: the first was "Improvement in Writing," with Dr. Albert R. Kitzhaber, professor of English, University of Oregon, as principal speaker, and the second was on procedures for applying for accreditation to the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, with Professor Thomas E. Kerr, then executive secretary of the Commission on Higher Schools, as principal speaker. This general, four-way pattern of organization is still in effect. The annual meetings are well-attended with good representation from each segment.

One of the group's objectives was coordination of appearances and proposals before the Legislative Assembly. This objective was achieved, and the results in favorable legislation were as much as could have been expected; however, there were some anxious moments. Although the total amount of $850,000 in 1961-63 and $1,350,000 appropriated for classroom construction in the 1963-65 biennium was not adequate in total dollars, the matching formula remains reasonable and now stands at 65 per cent of building and equipment. The 1961-63 formula was 75 per cent of buildings only. These two figures are comparable if one estimates equipment at 15 per cent of building costs.

The association employed its first "executive secretary," Tom Rigby, on a part-time basis in 1964, to act as legislative liaison and coordinator of information.

The operational support remains at $433 per full-time student equivalent; however, the F.T.E. formula was changed to 15 hours per term, effective 1964-65 school year. This represented a 20 per cent reduction, but the 1965 legislative assembly approved a measure to allow federal vocational funds to be paid to districts, over and above the $433, as long as the combined total does not exceed 85 per cent of the difference between actual operating costs and the amount received from tuition. The state reimbursement formula is subject to legislative review each biennium. The 1961 legislative concept was that the state should pay two-thirds of the operating costs, and the 1963 legislative assembly applied this general concept to buildings and equipment. In actual practice, considering constantly increasing operating costs, plus laboratory equipment, and, in the case of buildings, the general campus development costs, the actual percentage more nearly approximates a 50 per cent reimbursement. The improved federal legislation will help this situation.

State Department Reorganizes

With the advent of a system of community colleges, the State Department of Education was reorganized by the state superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Leon P. Minear, himself a former junior college president at Stockton, California.

The position of assistant superintendent of public instruction in charge of community colleges was created, and Dr. Robert O. Hatton, president of Kellogg Junior College, Battle Creek, Michigan, was named to the position. Dr. Hatton took office in the fall of 1962 and is now assisted by Dr. William G. Loomis, state director of vocational education, and Donald M. Gilles of the Division of Trade and Industrial Education.

Over the years, we in the forefront of the movement have had ideological differences with certain school superintendents who looked upon the superimposed "area districts" as unnecessary additions that might create problems of administration, be less economical, a threat to local tax bases, etc. Or, in some instances, individuals firmly believed in the educational philosophy of the "integrated" fourteen-year unified public school system. Some of this attitude was a carry-over of the Koos study and the concepts contained in the old, unused, junior college law. The former system in the state of Washington (recently under serious study by the legislature there) gave ammunition to this particular position. We of the opposition tried to think not in terms of what was, or had been, but how junior colleges *should* be organized. We recognized that the junior colleges in Washington and California, and many other states, had grown out of the extension of the secondary school system. We tried to appraise the trends and also predict the future on the basis of the current attitudes of junior community college presidents in these same northwest states if they had a choice. The writer's doctoral thesis gave some study to this and found that thirty out of thirty-four junior college presidents responding to the question favored the separate "area district" over any other type of control, including full state control. Time has played in our favor, and the college "area districts" now seem to have the full support of nearly all the public school administrators.

An Area Becomes a Community

Early-day towns and villages were developed as shopping and social centers, and were located as close together as a horse and buggy or ranch wagon could travel in a couple of hours. Travel is still measured in terms of "minutes" rather than "miles," but modern transportation has forced a change in our whole concept of distance, and makes it possible for a geographic area to behave in a cultural relationship comparable to what one town or community might have forty years ago. Yet the fear on the part of these separate towns or communities that they may lose their local autonomy is still very real, and the ghosts of ancient jealousies often appear to cloud the issue of the college "area district." (Central Oregon College has approximately 10,000 square miles of territory, seven high schools, and all of three and parts of three additional counties in its area district.)

Our experience is proving that a community college can make a "community" of a rather large, natural geographic area. An analysis of voter reaction shows that although the original issue carried in five of the six counties—in fact, the only unanimous vote favoring formation came from the residents of the county farthest away (Lake County, the northern part of which is included in the college district)—the heaviest support came from the Bend area. (The college was scheduled to be constructed in Bend.)

Each vote of the general constituency since then has presented a more even distribution of favorable votes, and last May 3, 1965, the support pattern was approximately equal in all six counties, indicating a "community" of interest and support of an area larger than some states. This pattern of "grass roots" approval seems to be generally taking place in Oregon. Much of the credit must go to the type of persons who have been attracted to our local college boards of education. Most of our large "area districts" are zoned for directors, to allay the ancient fears, but once elected the directors hold the college interests paramount. In the main, these boards consist of leading professional, business, and labor leaders of the individual communities. Typical of the wholesome attitude is a remark made by a charter member of the Central Oregon College Board, Rupert Park. Mr. Park, an attorney and resident of the nearby community of Redmond, led a campaign to have the college located in Redmond, the center of population. He was opposed by a Bend attorney, Mr. Owen Panner, who later became the first chairman of the college board, and who led a campaign to have the college remain in Bend, the largest town of the area. These two outstanding attorneys brought this battle to a head in the form of a public hearing before the State Board of Education. Testimony was presented by some forty persons on both sides to the largest audience ever to attend a hearing in Central Oregon (1,200 persons), and it consumed over four hours. When it was all over and the state board later rendered the verdict that the college would be located in Bend, Mr. Park remarked, "Although I believe in the Redmond location and have worked hard for it, I will now work equally hard for the success of a college in Bend"; and he has. This is typical of the fine caliber and attitude of the board members of the Oregon community colleges.

Learning From Each Other

Central Oregon College, having developed out of the General Extension Division of the State System of Higher Education, carried with it certain orientations that might differ from schools such as the ones in Eugene or Portland that have developed primarily out of secondary school vocational and adult education programs.

The fact is, that all of us seem to be learning from each other, as well as from other states, and we become more and more alike each year. Central Oregon College has pioneered academic rank for instructors, and now many others are adopting it. Southwestern Oregon adopted the system of higher education's salary plan and tenure system. Others are now considering this, or similar plans. Central Oregon College put into effect this year a system of paid sabbaticals, and we hope that others may follow.

Administratively, most of the Oregon schools are still divided into technical-vocational and liberal arts divisions, with each division headed by a dean. In 1963, Central Oregon College departed from this "two schools" concept, with two complete sets of curriculums, to a "one school" concept, with general education courses developed to support both the technical and the transfer programs, as well as a new series of preparatory courses in reading, writing, and math to prepare students found deficient to enter either of these major areas. Administratively, we have one dean of faculty and four college divisions, with technical and vocational programs assigned to the division to which they are by their nature most related.

In Conclusion

It has not been the purpose of this article to go into details of the various statutes that have been, or are currently, back of the community colleges and technical-vocational schools of Oregon, but to provide the reader with an overview of the historical development of the community college movement in the state. We in Oregon are proud of our development and make no apologies for being late on the national scene. We anticipate making up for lost time. New construction and new site developments have taken, or are taking, place at nine of the eleven established schools. Four are now operating on their own permanent campuses as construction continues (Central Oregon, Clatsop, Salem, and Southwestern Oregon). Five others are operating in temporary facilities as they develop permanent campuses (Blue Mountain, Lane, Portland, Treasure Valley, and Umpqua). Mt. Hood College has just been formed, and the Oregon City school operates in its own quarters as part of the Oregon City school system. This area southeast of Portland was one of the two places where the "area district" vote failed, but the writer understands that proponents of this area are planning to bring the issue to a vote again soon.

We hope and believe that, in the formulation of our statutes for the two-year college, whether it be primarily a liberal arts program, a technical-vocational school, or a comprehensive program with all types of post-high school education being adequately represented, we have profited from the experience of other states and certainly from the counsel and advice of those in the national offices. We believe our current statute, including amendments from the 1963 and 1965 legislative assemblies, represents progressive legislation and provides an appropriate

2

framework for the development of a fine system of community colleges in the state of Oregon.

Five Years of Progress In Florida

By James L. Wattenbarger

In the fall of 1962, over half of the Florida freshmen who enrolled in higher education were enrolled in Florida's public junior colleges. The percentage of freshmen enrolled in junior colleges has increased each year; the 1962 figures, however, represent the highest level to date. There were twenty-nine junior colleges operating in seventeen junior college areas located within commuting distance of 63 per cent of the state's high school graduates.

Because of the great increase in junior college attendance and because of the importance these institutions hold in relationship to the total program of higher education in the state, the State Junior College Board felt that one of its first activities should be to conduct an evaluative study to determine the progress which had been made over the five years since the 1957 legislature approved the expansion of the junior college program.

The board specifically set up three purposes for the evaluative study: (1) to determine the progress that has been made in Florida's junior college development; (2) to study the long-range educational planning as it may relate to the business and industrial development of Florida; (3) to develop specific plans regarding all phases of community junior college programs so that the quality and the effectiveness of the educational services of these institutions might be improved. The final report of the study is now available.

The board appointed five task forces which were made up of thirty-three members of junior college faculties. The study was also supervised by a coordinating committee whose membership was composed of representatives from the legislature, from junior college faculties, from junior college advisory boards, and from the board of control.

The time of the study extended over eighteen months, at the end of which the board reviewed the recommendations of the task forces and the recommendations of the coordinating committee. From these its own recommendations were developed. These are outlined in the final report.

The study was divided into five areas: aims and purposes, students, faculty, year-round operation, and legal structure. Here is a summary of the reports:

Aims and Purposes

The basic functions of Florida's junior colleges as defined in the law and as interpreted by the task force of junior college faculty members, seemed to be accepted and understood by a selected sample of citizens of the communities served by these institutions. The sample of the opinions rated the described functions in the following order of importance:

1. The freshman-sophomore college program
2. A comprehensive program of guidance
3. Technical, business, and semiprofessional programs
4. Adult noncredit courses, seminars, and institutes
5. A program of student activities
6. Occupationally oriented programs of a vocational nature.

It was interesting to note that the order in which these items were placed varied from college to college. As a matter of fact, some colleges placed technical, business, and semiprofessional programs at the top of the list, while other colleges placed importance upon these items in a different order. This fact emphasized one of the findings which the State Junior College Board listed in its report: all communities do not expect the same service from their community junior colleges. There is a degree of diversity between the communities and their expectations or their own local institutions. This diversity is reflected in the attitudes of the selected citizens in the communities as well as in the various programs that are available in the junior colleges.

In 1957, the Community College Council pointed out to the legislature that there were barriers which prevented young people from continuing beyond high school. These were described as geographic, economic, and motivational. The Community College Council suggested that community junior colleges would contribute toward overcoming these barriers. There is specific evidence that the junior colleges have done much to eliminate these barriers, and that junior colleges are extending opportunities to many citizens who otherwise would not have had an opportunity.

In a questionnaire directed to students 48 per cent of the junior college students reported that they attended a particular junior college because of its proximity to their homes; 27 per cent reported that the cost was a major factor influencing their decision to enroll in a particular junior college. Over 70 per cent of these young people indicated that they had achieved the highest educational level in their immediate family.

Students

Florida's community junior colleges have a varied student body. For example, the age of junior college students in Florida varies from 16 to 78. Men outnumber women students three to two; the usual collegiate ratio in this regard is three to one, indicating that Florida's junior colleges are being of particular service to young women who wish to continue beyond high school.

Some interesting facts about Florida junior college students' financial level were indicated by whether or not they work. Fifty-eight per cent of Florida junior college students work while attending the junior colleges. Approximately 10 per cent report that they have full-time jobs while attending junior college full-time.

Another interesting point is that 73 per cent of the junior college students in Florida plan to stay in Florida after they complete their education. This is a reversal of a past trend when students moved away from the state after they completed their higher education at an out-of-state institution.

The board noted that while Florida's community junior colleges served students who represent a wide range of abilities, approximately one-half of the college credit students in the state are readily admissible to the state universities under the present Board of Control admission policies. Over 50 per cent of the junior college students scored 300 or above. In actuality, less than 10 per cent of the students scored in the lowest quintile, emphasizing the fact that junior colleges probably are doing even less for this group than they are for the top group.

Faculty

The Faculty Task Force found out many interesting facts about Florida's junior college faculties. For example, over 12 per cent of these individuals hold doctor's degrees, and an additional 77 per cent hold master's degrees, leaving only 11 per cent who do not hold master's or doctor's degrees. These few are teaching in vocationally oriented programs which do not require an advanced academic degree. Almost half of Florida's junior college faculty members have previous experience teaching in a four-year college, and almost 70 per cent have taught at some other level of education previous to their teaching in the junior college.

These factors, a relatively high level of academic preparation and a diversity of experience, have contributed to quality teaching. The board found that the morale of junior college faculties is high. Ninety per cent reported that they were satisfied with junior college teaching as a career; only 8 per cent reported that the morale of the college was below average.

The median salary for Florida's junior college faculty members for 1960-61 was only $5,800 for ten months. This is $1,400 less than the national median for junior college faculty members for nine months. Florida junior colleges are, in fact, going backward in this regard, since in 1957 there was an $800 differential between the national and state medians. The provision for a more nearly adequate salary is a major difficulty in continuing to employ the quality of faculty which is needed in the junior college program.

It was also interesting to note that over 40 per cent of the faculty members reported that they were in favor of the principle of merit pay for teachers. However, three-fourths of the group indicated a strong opposition to the criteria currently in use.

During the five-year period, 1957-1961, Florida's junior colleges increased in number from five to twenty-five; in enrollment from 5,000 to 30,000; and in size of faculty from 240 to more than 1,100. This rate of growth was unmatched elsewhere in the United States. In the fall of 1962, a continued increase was reported when twenty-nine junior colleges enrolled 38,000 students.

The board also noted that there was a great need for year-round operation in the junior colleges, especially in relationship to the articulation with the universities. One of the strong recommendations from the study was for year-round operation of the junior colleges.

Legal Structure

The Legal Structure Task Force pointed up the need for continued state coordination. This becomes a more time-consuming responsibility with twenty-nine institutions than for the five which were in existence in 1957. With this in mind, the Junior College Board has recommended that the authority which had been granted to it by the 1961 legislature be described more clearly by specifying that the State Junior College Board has this statewide coordinative responsibility acting under the supervision of the State Board of Education. The board specifies that the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the State Department of Education constitutes the board's staff and that the entire staff of the State Department of Education should continue to provide help to the board as needed.

Upon careful analysis of the local control status and function, the board reported that no better, no more economical, no more efficient organization could be devised for Florida. Florida's junior college growth and development has resulted largely because of the extensive help and support from the local public school systems. The board, therefore, recommended that no change be made in reference to local control.

As a result of the examination of the existing problems in administrative procedures, however, a joint committee of presidents and superintendents has developed policy statements designed to improve local procedures.

The study was an extensive one; it has provided a great deal of information regarding Florida's community junior colleges. New questions for continued investigation have appeared; more information about students who do not transfer is needed; more information about getting new programs started; more information about faculty improvement. *Five Years of Progress* takes its place as part of the continuing program for improving educational opportunity in Florida.

Addendum

Since the above article was written, additional developments have taken place in Florida. The median salary for two semesters of work is now $7,200. The 1965 Florida Legislature approved five new junior college areas, and now the master plan for community junior college development is completed except for one area of the state.

There are twenty areas currently operating junior colleges. These provide a community junior college opportunity within commuting distance of more than 77 per cent of the state's high school graduates. When all of the junior college areas now authorized by the legislature are in operation there will be twenty-seven institutions providing junior college education within commuting distance of 95 per cent of the state's population. After that, one more area will complete the master plan. It is estimated that all areas will be in operation before 1970.

During the past two years growth in enrollment in occupational programs has increased almost twice as fast as the total enrollment. Over ninety different occupational programs are available, and almost 25 per cent of the students are enrolled in these courses.

The total enrollment in Florida's community junior colleges during 1964-65 exceeded 104,000 students. Over 60 per cent of the freshmen in Florida were attending junior colleges last year, and in some universities the junior classes were the largest classes.

The estimates for 1970 indicate that almost 200,000 students will be enrolled in the junior colleges in Florida at that time. This growth will have occurred during the fifteen years since the 1955 legislature established the Community College Council Study—from 3,700 students to 200,000 students in fifteen years.

56

North Carolina Is Counting On Community Colleges

By Howard R. Boozer

North Carolina has been slow to develop public community colleges. In 1950 the state superintendent of public instruction authorized a study of the need for a system of state-supported community colleges. This study, which included a basic plan for the development of such a system was published in 1952[1] but the recommended program was not adopted by the 1953 General Assembly.

However, in 1955, the General Assembly did make small grants-in-aid to the four municipally supported community colleges in the state, amounting, in the aggregate, to less than $20,000 each year of the 1955-57 biennium.

Additional progress was made after the creation in 1955 of the State Board of Higher Education, when provisions were made for state appropriations for capital purposes on a matching basis and for grants-in-aid for operational purposes.

With the passage of the Community College Act of 1957, the continuing participation of the state was formalized. This participation was limited, however, to the provision on a matching basis of funds for the construction of academic facilities and grants-in-aid in partial support of the college parallel curriculum. One new college came into being under the 1957 act, making a total of only five public community colleges in the state as of the 1962-63 school year. One additional college was chartered in January, 1963; it began classes in September, 1964.

North Carolina, in company with many other states, faces a college enrollment crisis in the years immediately ahead. Its fifty-eight collegiate institutions[2] enrolled 75,201 students in the fall of 1961—40,056 in tax-supported colleges and 35,145 in private institutions. Divided another way, 65,478 were enrolled in the senior colleges (public and private) and 8,846 were in the junior colleges: 6,438 in the fifteen private junior colleges and 2,408 in the five public community colleges. Junior college enrollment represented 11.8 per cent of the total in the higher education institutions in the state.[3]

Since 1957, in addition to public community colleges and other collegiate institutions, the state has also had a system of industrial education centers.[4] As of September, 1963, nineteen were in operation. These centers are essentially post-high school institutions created to train technicians and skilled craftsmen.

The first I.E.C.'s opened in 1959 and within the twelve months preceding March, 1963, were attended by more than 35,000 persons. Approximately 2,100 students were enrolled in two-year technician curriculums in the spring of 1963 on either a full- or part-time basis, and as of June, 1963, more than 4,000 persons had completed these two-year programs.

The Governor's Commission

Early in 1961 the Board of Higher Education requested that Governor Terry Sanford appoint a Community College Advisory Committe which would undertake a thorough study leading to a long-range plan for the development of community colleges and possible additional senior institutions. The scope of the proposed study was enlarged, and in September, 1961, a Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School was appointed. This twenty-five-member commission was composed of legislators, educators, and laymen. The work of the commission was completed in August, 1962, and its report was published in December, 1962.[5]

In order better to understand the quantitative dimensions of the problems faced by higher education in the next two decades, the Governor's Commission and the Board of Higher Education jointly authorized a study of enrollment projections. This study, completed early in 1962, predicted enrollment of 117,700 in the colleges and universities by 1970, an increase of 42,500 over the 1961 figure.[6] Private colleges indicated in a survey that they planned to enroll 46,395 students in 1970, or 11,250 more than in the fall of 1961. This left the state with the responsibility of providing higher education opportunity by 1970 for approximately 71,300 students, about 31,250 or 78 per cent more than in the fall of 1961.

These projections dealt only with likely enrollments in regular collegiate programs and did not take into account the additional thousands who will need and desire post-high school education of a vocational, technical, or semiprofessional nature. A comprehensive study in 1961 of technical and skilled manpower needs in the years ahead revealed that industries in the state will require an additional 20,320 skilled craftsmen and 6,321 technicians by 1966, over and above the numbers then employed in these categories.

Hope in the Community College

It was immediately clear to the Governor's Commission, from the above projections, that the number of qualified persons who will be seeking post-high school education in North Carolina in the years ahead will greatly exceed the capacity of existing institutions. The policy question facing the commission and the state was how this tremendous need could best be met. The major problem was obviously related to enrollments at the undergraduate level, particularly in the freshman and sophomore years. The alternatives were the expansion of present residential institutions by building additional classrooms and dormitories, the creation of additional colleges, or a rational combination of the two.

The commission decided, not surprisingly, that a realistic expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new colleges was the wisest course to take. It recognized immediately that the hope for the future with reference to new institutions is the community college, diversified in scope and comprehensive in its programs and curriculums, which will put post-high school education within the financial and geographical reach of many qualified persons who otherwise will not be able to continue their education.

A study of the need for additional community colleges in the state, including their likely locations and service areas, was later made under the auspices of the Governor's Commission and the Board of Higher Education. Taking into account the accessibility of possible locations to potential students and the proximity of existing public and private colleges and universities, and on the conservative assumption that by 1966 a comprehensive community college should have a potential enrollment in college parallel courses alone of 400 students, fourteen areas in which community colleges were needed and would be likely to succeed were identified.[8]

Two Parallel Systems or One

In considering the future of the community college in North Carolina the commission took note of a number of facts. The few community colleges already in existence tended to concentrate their energies on college parallel programs. The relative emphasis on technical-vocational and adult education was minor. Two major factors accounted for this: the existence of a system of industrial education centers separately organized and administered, and the fact that state support was not provided in the community colleges for adult education programs or for technical-vocational-terminal programs of less than college grade. The focus of the public community colleges on college parallel programs, plus the location of three of the five in Charlotte, Wilmington, and Asheville (population centers lacking public senior colleges), combined to create strong currents in favor of the eventual conversion of these three institutions to senior colleges.

The community colleges and the industrial education centers, both tax-supported, post-high school institutions of two-year grade, were completely separate systems. At the state level the community colleges were within the jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education; the industrial education centers were under the State Board of Education. The methods of financing were dissimilar. Capital expenditures for community colleges were provided on a matching basis by the county and by the state. Current support was provided from student fees, local taxes, and grants-in-aid from the state, with the limitation that state support could not exceed that provided by local taxes. In the case of the industrial education centers the land and buildings (and their maintenance) were provided locally and the operating funds were provided through various federal programs and by the state. No tuition was charged and fees were negligible.

The commission was faced with the question of whether there would be a system of community colleges, with their own functions and identities, and with the prior question of whether the state should perpetuate two parallel systems of post-high school two-year institutions ("community colleges" on the one hand, "industrial education centers" on the other), or create *one* system of "comprehensive" community colleges.

The commission was aware of the consensus among outstanding educators in the community junior college field that, in principle, the community college should be comprehensive, incorporating in one institution appropriate technical-vocational, college parallel, and adult education curriculums responsive to the needs of the area served by the college. Further, it was aware that in a number of other states the experience has been that technical-vocational institutions eventually add general education curriculums and become more comprehensive in scope.

This tendency was already apparent in the industrial education centers in North Carolina. There was recognition in many quarters that the I.E.C.'s should make available a broadened curriculum. As early as February, 1962, two committees of the Governor's Commission had adopted resolutions urging the State Board of Education to make instruction in the liberal arts available in the industrial education centers as soon as practicable. On the other hand, the state, through the 1957 Community College Act, was already committed to support technical programs of college grade and college parallel courses in the community colleges.

Recommendations of the Commission

Major recommendations of the Commission[9] with respect to the future development of post-high school institutions dealt with a statutory definition of the functions of the University of North Carolina (with three campuses—at Chapel Hill, Raleigh, and Greensboro) as the only tax-supported institution in the state with the authority to offer doctoral programs and award doctor's degrees; the conversion of the community colleges in Charlotte, Wilmington, and Asheville to senior colleges; and the development of a new system of comprehensive community colleges.

These recommendations were incorporated into the administration's bill on higher education which, with very few modifications, became law when ratified by the General Assembly of North Carolina on May 17, 1963.[10]

Major Features of the New System

The Governor's Commission came to the conclusion that the community colleges and industrial education centers would tend to become more alike than unlike; that the perpetuation of two increasingly similar but separate systems of post-high school institutions of two-year grade could not be justified on educational or economic grounds; and that the continuation of state-level supervision of the two systems in different agencies would lead to undesirable competition, lack of effectiveness and efficiency, and economic waste. Therefore, the commission recommended that the state develop one system of public two-year post-high school institutions offering university parallel, technical-vocational-terminal, and adult education instruction tailored to local and area needs; and that comprehensive community colleges so created (including industrial education centers and technical institutes) be subject to state level supervision by one agency—the State Board of Education. The State Board of Higher Education concurred in this recommendation. This structure is now provided for by statute.

The commission also recommended that the State Board of Education perform its supervisory duties through a new agency created for that purpose and responsible directly to the board, with a professional staff composed of persons with training and experience appropriate to the supervision of collegiate institutions.

It further recommended that there be created a Community College Advisory Council which would advise the State Board of Education on matters relating to personnel, curriculums, finance, articulation, and coordination with other institutions, and other policy matters concerning community colleges.

Following the enactment of the Higher Education Act, which included the above provision, the State Board of Education in June, 1963, established a Department of Community Colleges with I. E. Ready as director. The Community College Advisory Council, consisting of sixteen members, was also appointed in June, 1963. Its chairman is Allan S. Hurlburt, professor of education at Duke University. Dr. Hurlburt was director of the 1952 Community College Study sponsored by the State Department of Public Instruction.

Other major features of the new law, largely reflecting the recommendations of the Governor's Commission, are that responsibility for local control of post-high school, two-year institutions (community colleges, technical institutes, and industrial education centers) is vested in a board of trustees of each institution which is independent of other education boards; that the state may match local funds for the construction of facilities up to a maximum of $500,000 at each institution;[11] and that operational costs at each institution are to be borne by the county of location (15 per cent), by the students (20 per cent), and by the state—including federal assistance in support of certain programs (65 per cent). These proportions are approximate. The operating budgets of these institutions are by line items with responsibilities at local and state levels specified. For example, localities provide for maintenance and operation of plant, and may supplement other items in the budget.

The 1963 and 1965 General Assemblies made available to the State Board of Education the funds required to implement the community college provisions of the Higher Education Act. Twenty-three institutions (five community colleges, fifteen technical institutes, and three industrial education centers) will be in operation by Fall, 1965, under the aegis of the Department of Community Colleges of the State Board of Education. Seven additional community colleges have been authorized (as of June, 1965), and will open their doors by Fall, 1966. Enrollment in these institutions is increasing by leaps and bounds. Full-time equivalent (F.T.E.) enrollment in 1963-64 of 8,500 students will have doubled in two years (by 1965-66) to approximately 17,000.

A Bright Future

The Higher Education Act included significant gains which will mark the 1963 North Carolina General Assembly as one of the most forward-looking in the history of the state. This enabling legislation provided the framework for the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges, open to all qualified students without regard to race, which will do much to democratize educational opportunity in North Carolina. This legislation augurs well for the future of community colleges in the state. They will be of vital importance in meeting the post-high school and higher educational demands of the future.[12]

---

[1] *Community College Study.* Raleigh, North Carolina: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1952. 44 pp.

[2] There are, in addition, four theological or Bible schools.

[3] Total enrollment had increased to 92,993 students (52,101 in tax-supported and 40,892 in private institutions) by Fall, 1964, a 24 per cent increase in three years. A study recently completed projects that the enrollment in Fall, 1965, will rise to 107,800—an increase of approximately 16 per cent in one year. "During the same period the number of new college freshmen is expected to increase by 30.5 per cent, that is from 26,125 in 1964 to 34,088 in 1965." Hamilton, C. Horace, *Projection of Fall Enrollment in North Carolina Colleges and Universities.* Mimeographed, January, 1965, p. 1.

[4] In addition, there are 113 proprietary, trade, and vocational schools in the state.

[5] *The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School.* Raleigh, North Carolina: 1962. 133 pp.

[6] Hamilton, C. Horace. *Projection of Fall Enrollment in North Carolina Colleges and Universities,* 1962-80, Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State College, 1962. p. v. Hamilton predicted that 80,000 students would be enrolled in Fall, 1962; 82,900 in Fall, 1963; and 87,300 in Fall, 1964. Actual enrollments in those years were 80,804 in 1962, 86,085 in 1963 and 92,993 in 1964.

[7] Employment Security Commission of North Carolina. *North Carolina Study of Technical and Skilled Manpower Requirements.* Raleigh, North Carolina: Employment Security Commission, 1962. 87 pp.

[8] Hamilton, C. Horace. *Community Colleges for North Carolina: A Study of Need, Location, and Service Areas.* Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State College, 1962. 66 pp., abridged edition.

[9] The sixty-one recommendations of the commission are listed seriatim in the *Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School* on pages 1-11. Those concerning community colleges appear on pages 4-6 of the report.

[10] S.B. 72 (as amended), "An Act to Promote and Encourage Education Beyond the High School in North Carolina." The 1965 General Assembly created a fourth campus of the University in Charlotte incorporating Charlotte College into the Consolidated University of North Carolina.

[11] This is the only point on which the legislation differed significantly from the recommendations of the Governor's Commission. The commission recommended that funds for all capital purposes be provided locally.

[12] A staff study concerning community colleges, completed in the spring of 1962 by the author, has been drawn upon heavily in this article. Parts of that study were incorporated in the report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School (1962).

Bold Plans for the Bay State

By Walter M. Taylor

"Massachusetts . . . there she is . . . Behold her." A wag in the U.S. Senate gallery hearing Daniel Webster's oratory that day in 1830 is said to have appended an irreverent "All alone!"

The Massachusetts plan for public community colleges remains unique—comes close to being "all alone"—in perhaps seven respects:

1. Control and financing, wisely, resides at state level.

2. Costs are not reflected in local or regional tax levies.

3. The state plan assures coverage of 97 per cent of the homes of the state with "geographical accessibility." No student need travel more than thirty miles or forty-five minutes in one-way daily commuting.

4. The state plan assures all regions of equal financial support; economically poorer regions are not penalized.

5. The unpaid fifteen-member state board of control has responsibility for no other program than that of the community college; its energies are not diffused.

6. Policy does not have to respond to local pressures but can respond flexibly to differences in regional need.

7. As now composed, the board includes a significant number of the "best educational brains in the Commonwealth."

These uniquenesses require some explaining. If they are valid, they may be applicable to other states in which population density and the road network make adaptation easy. The plan's progenitors share, in common with proponents of public junior-community colleges everywhere, their desire to make post-secondary education short of the baccalaureate degree available at low cost, with real geographic accessibility, to large numbers of young Americans including many for whom the doors of educational opportunity would otherwise be closed.

Authorization to establish public junior colleges had existed in legislation in Massachusetts since 1932, but no one had had the gumption or the persuasiveness, or both, to implement the authorization with dollars. Numerous state studies, dating back to 1922, had recommended community colleges, but only the cities of Newton, Holyoke, and Quincy had acted, as early as 1946, in establishing municipally controlled junior colleges to meet the demands of veterans returning from World War II. But these colleges have had to fight for their very existence with tax-conscious mayors and city councilmen who demanded that they operate at little or no expense to the local taxpayer.

With the passage of the Lee Bill in 1952, the three cities could claim reimbursement from the state for 50 per cent of the excess of cost over income, up to $100 per full-time student. But the pressure on the municipally controlled junior college to "operate in the black" meant that Newton's $400 per year tuition was the highest tuition rate in the nation for a publicly controlled junior college.

Audit of State Needs

The three cities continued, however, to provide post-secondary education for their constituencies and to build up an enviable record of successful transfer of their graduates to senior institutions—despite nonaccreditation. It was only in December, 1963, that Newton achieved accreditation, thus becoming the first publicly sponsored junior college in New England to gain that status.

Meanwhile, in 1957, researchers for gubernatorial candidate Foster Furcolo were auditing state needs.

The list of needs uncovered was imposing: tax reform, attraction of new industry to Massachusetts, an overdue constitutional convention—and increased opportunities for higher education.

By 1972, the New England Board of Higher Education declared, New England, the area of greatest concentration of institutions of higher learning, would be 95,000 student-spaces short for qualified high school graduates, 60 per cent of them in Massachusetts alone.

The Audit of State Needs declared expanded opportunities for higher education to be the primary need among the many it studied. The executive secretary of the audit, John Powers Mallan,* then a Smith College professor of political science and a member of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges, drafted what became the implementing law of the Commonwealth (section 27, ch. 15) which set up the board and delineated its responsibilities for establishing and maintaining a system of regional community colleges strategically located throughout the state so that there would hardly be a home from which a student could not get to college in three-quarters of an hour. Tuition was set at $200 per year, the same as for state colleges and the University of Massachusetts.

Generally, opposition to the plan, since it had Democratic blessing, was largely of a politically partisan nature, but fears were allayed when the stature and bipartisanship of the State Board of Regional Community Colleges was announced.

The board itself is unique. It has contained a generous share of topflight educators. Wellesley

---

** An interesting historical footnote to the passage of the federal "Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963" is the part played by Professor Mallan and his success in obtaining the very active support of the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House. One of the speaker's secretaries, Dr. Martin Sweig, was also a member of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges. (Dr. Mallan is now a member of the AAJC staff.)*

College President Margaret Claff; Professor Seymour Harris of Harvard, now economic adviser to the President in Washington; and President Frederick Meier of the State College at Salem were among the leaders in education who provided assurance that policies adopted were sound. Roger Cutler, an adviser to President Eisenhower; Roger Lowell Putnam, industrialist (and a relative of A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard); Gwendolyn Woods of the State Congress of Parents and Teachers; and William Belanger of the state AFL-CIO were among the noneducators who saw to it that the program was not conceived in any ivory tower and who could talk effectively to legislative ways and means committees. Appointments to the board are for five years.

One Man's Energy

There is practically unanimous agreement in Massachusetts that the program might have been stillborn, however, had not one man's energy and drive been there, on the spot, daily, weekly, monthly. The board's present chairman is Kermit C. Morrissey, now dean of students at Brandeis University. Mr. Morrissey was an instructor in government at Amherst College when he was drafted to organize a research team for Governor Furcolo. He remained with the governor as director of the budget and constant adviser to the Board of Regional Community Colleges, returning to academic life in 1960. In the same year he was nominated to fill a board vacancy and was subsequently designated its chairman. From this unpaid position he has directed its progress with singular purpose through the establishment of colleges at Pittsfield, Haverhill, Hyannis, Boston, Greenfield, Worcester, and, most recently, in Gardner, Holyoke, and Beverly. In Holyoke the municipally operated junior college now has become state-operated. To date colleges have thus been established at the rate of one or more per year.

The establishment of colleges in Brockton and Fall River has already been authorized. Only the west-of-Boston area requires legal approval to complete the original master plan of 1958. The legislature has appropriated $100,000 for a new master plan study which is under the direction of Donald Deyo, former president of the American Association of Junior Colleges. But annually legislative representatives eager to bring colleges to their home areas present bills "authorizing and directing" the board to establish a college here or there. To date, wiser heads have prevailed and the initial plan still holds firm. Among the 3,000 or more bills going through the 1965 legislature are at least eight of these favorite-son bills.

This political fact points to one source of potential insecurity in total financing from the state level. Will the board always be able to maintain control over the location of the colleges? Will legislators, defeated in their ambitions to get colleges where they want them, ultimately deny colleges located elsewhere their proper financial support? The path of fiscal support will be no smoother than the path for any of the state's other institutions of higher learning. To date, the support of the community colleges has been increasingly nonpartisan if, in a few specific regards, discouragingly weak.

For example, the colleges are smarting under an 18-1 student-teacher ratio because all administrative personnel except the directors (now presidents) and their administrative assistants must be hired as faculty members. Thus, the dean of students, the librarian, and the director of guidance and counseling must occupy positions allocated for instructors, thereby reducing the number of positions available for full-time instructors themselves. Whether an effective learning-and-teaching outcome can be expected under this condition is open to serious doubt. To be sure there are few if any instances of the administrator who is not teaching one or more classes (except for the presidents themselves). And to require the full-time librarian to teach one or more classes violates the spirit if not the letter of standards of accreditation. The colleges have asked for these positions in their budgets, without success to date.

Another area of grave concern is that of total, internal, financial responsibility as represented by the "autonomy" that the state university achieved by law in 1962 and the nine-state colleges achieved by law in 1963. Under "autonomy" a college may shift funds from one subsidiary account to another provided, of course, the total budget is not changed. The community colleges now have this privilege.

A quarter-of-a-million-dollar study of all levels of education in the commonwealth was conducted under the direction of Benjamin Willis and the recommendations of this commission have been enacted into law. One of the major provisions of this legislation is the coordination of publicly supported higher education in the state. The direction given to community colleges is consistent with the generally accepted purposes of a comprehensive program.

Starting a College

Meanwhile, the board's policy of getting a college functioning has resulted in the discovery that for $250,000 and the gift of an existing building acceptable to the state board a region can have a comprehensive community college for 500 students. This policy has resulted in a 1963-64 enrollment of 2,500 students in abandoned college buildings (Hyannis and Boston); a former town hall and elementary school (Haverhill); a former junior high school (Pittsfield); a building that was successively a high school, a junior high school, and an elementary school (Greenfield); and an abandoned college building (Boston). Quinsigamond Community College (Worcester) occupied space at Holy Cross College, and Mount Wachusett Community College will occupy the civil defense facility in Gardner which was previously a high school.

Each college starts with a renovated building, $80,000 to $100,000 for furniture and equipment,

$25,000 for a 4,000 book library. Land and buildings are apt to be gifts "for $1 and other consideration," or for long-term leases at $1 per year.

Cape Cod Community College will undertake construction of a new $7 million campus of more than one hundred acres in the coming year. Plans for permanent campuses are underway for Massachusetts Bay, Northern Essex, and Berkshire Community Colleges. The donation of sites by regions is a problem only in that many more are offered than could possibly be used. Mount Wachusett Community College in Gardner already has thirty-three offers, including one by the City of Gardner of a site of two hundred seventy acres, or any land owned by the city. The colleges in Brockton and Fall River will be of new construction on permanent sites; both cities have donated over 100 acres for each campus.

State Board Members

The success of the long-range plans depends, again, on the wisdom of the state board and its dedication to its mission. Present on the board are Owen B. Kierman, the commissioner of education, ex-officio; John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts, ex-officio; George D. Blackwood, professor at Boston University and director of several state studies related to education; Henry E. Foley, lawyer, who has been active in public welfare, municipal research, crime and delinquency; The Very Reverend Raymond J. Swords, S.J., president of the College of the Holy Cross, who made facilities available at Holy Cross for the first year of Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester; James Hammond, president of the State College at Fitchburg; Joseph Driscoll, president of Southeast Massachusetts Technological Institute, ex-officio; and William Dean, director of the Holyoke Trade High School, who has had a long-time, active interest in the affairs of the youth of the commonwealth. Their regular presence at board meetings has provided the colleges with policies and standards of excellence which have resulted in lively centers of learning.

Two policies may be of interest: (1) no intercollegiate athletics until the problems of an intermural physical activities program for all have been solved: (2) no fraternities or sororities.

These have not been easy policies to swallow in view of the ordinary image of going to college. Nor have they been easy to enforce where faculty or others have asserted that a college is not a college unless it has these appendages.

Indeed the major problems of the community colleges in Massachusetts may be the ones observed elsewhere, particularly the unreadiness of many faculty members to study and act upon recognizable differences between junior and senior colleges; between community colleges with multi-purposes (including continuing education for adults) and liberal arts colleges; between transfer and non-transfer education; between effective and less effective teaching methods.

Nevertheless the Massachusetts picture for faculty members is not unattractive. Salaries took a leap for the better with the adoption, in November, 1963, of a seven-step scale with starting and top salaries as follows. Faculty positions do not carry rank, but the pay-scale uses the customary four categories, possibly with an eye to future developments:

Instructors	**$6,084.00**	**(Step 1)**	**to**	**$ 7,768.80**	**(Step 7)**
Assistant professors	**7,066.80**	**"**	**to**	**9,032.40**	**"**
Associate professors	**8,174.40**	**"**	**to**	**10,420.80**	**"**
Professors	**9,750.00**	**"**	**to**	**12,464.40**	**"**

At these rates it is not difficult to fill faculty positions except in the usual critical areas (electronics, for instance) in which colleges compete with industry for personnel. Even so, the percentages of full-time faculty with masters' and doctors' degrees is higher than for the nation and the percentage of those not yet possessing their master's degrees is smaller. Possession of the master's is ordinarily the *sine qua non* to appointment.

Colleges are providing some in-service training utilizing counterpart conferences and intercollege workshops. The University of Massachusetts has instituted a program leading to the M.A.T. (C.C.) degree, "C.C." standing for "community colleges." Presidents are getting to the junior college administration seminars at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Surveys of students indicate the continuing need for guidance and advisement personnel, representing an area of concern with much room for improvement. The record of student transfers to the university and to senior colleges is good.

Currently, Cape Cod will have $6.9 million and Northern Essex $.5 million for site development toward the construction of new campuses in handsome settings. Massachusetts Bay has branched to a new Raytheon office building in Watertown and in two sites accommodates about 1,300 students. New construction will start next year for Massachusetts Bay.

The North Shore Community College opened in September, 1965, with 500 students. Berkshire has received $.25 million for planning.

The system is, then, in Massachusetts to stay. Gains are to be consolidated, refinements to be made, new areas to be tackled with the same boldness that has brought the commonwealth from a state of somnolence to one of healthy ferment and growth.

Something New in New Jersey

By Kenneth C. MacKay

In May, 1962, when Governor Richard J. Hughes signed into law the so-called County College Bill, New Jersey received a second chance to move ahead with the rest of the nation in the development of two-year community colleges.

It was back in the depression days of the 1930's that New Jersey fumbled its first extraordinary opportunity to be among the earliest states in the Union to have a permanent state-wide system of junior colleges.

In 1933, at a historic meeting in Washington, a group of New Jersey educators persuaded Harry Hopkins, director of the Emergency Relief Administration (later the W.P.A.) to allocate funds for several new and experimental junior colleges. These colleges were to offer evening programs in certain available high schools pending permanent quarters. The purpose of these colleges was to provide post-secondary education for qualified students unable to go away to college or find employment. Union Junior College, the first of these "depression colleges," opened its doors in October, 1933. Altogether, six colleges, bearing county designations, were established.

When, several years later, federal support was withdrawn and no state funds were forthcoming (despite bills introduced in the legislature), and when World War II depleted student ranks, four of the W.P.A. colleges disappeared. Only Union and Monmouth survived, the former reorganized as an independent, liberal arts junior college, and the latter eventually decided to become a four-year independent institution maintaining a junior college division. Without state legislation to provide governmental aid, both institutions have had to depend upon student tuition as the chief source of income.

Historically, several factors in New Jersey have worked against the establishment of a system of public junior colleges. The state has been, along with much of the eastern seaboard and New England, steeped in the traditional concepts of the academic four-year college programs. Venerable institutions of learning have molded a public image of what constitutes higher education. With several notable exceptions like Centenary, Union, and Trenton, the junior colleges of the state have been small institutions specializing in religious training.

An antiquated tax system based on property valuation has kept the state in an economic bind and prevented proper fiscal planning and investment in higher education.

New Jersey's geographic position, sandwiched between the great metropolitan areas of New York and Philadelphia, has encouraged an undue dependence upon the cultural and educational opportunities across the Hudson and Delaware rivers.

Periodically, starting in 1930, educational authorities and reports in New Jersey stressed the need for a permanent system of junior colleges, notably in the annual reports and recommendations of the Regents from 1930 through 1939, and in the Cullimore Report of 1950. But the result was always inaction—until 1958.

Of historical significance is the fact that the State Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the commissioner, Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger, created the Office of Community and Two-Year College Education in December, 1958. Further, the office was given special recognition by the classification of its director at the highest possible professional level within the State Department of Education. For a long time the commissioner had observed the growing role of the junior college and appreciated its potentialities for New Jersey.

In 1959, a study committee of nineteen members was appointed by the commissioner to determine the needs of New Jersey for community-centered colleges. Specifically, the charge to the Committee to Study Community Colleges and Technical Institutes directed it "to explore not only the type of post-high school programs and opportunities to be developed, but also the legal and financial arrangements which would be best suited to the needs of New Jersey."

This committee represented all phases of higher education in New Jersey and included both professional and lay representatives.

For nearly two years this group met almost monthly, studying and analyzing surveys and gathering as much information as possible, both about the needs of New Jersey and the experience of other states. Professional consultants and national experts, including Dean Donald E. Deyo, members of the AAJC staff, and Dr. S. V. Martorana, were called in.

By the end of 1960, the report of this committee was ready, and in January, 1961, the New Jersey State Board of Education submitted its findings and recommendations to the governor and legislature in a document titled "Education Beyond the High School: The Two-Year Community College."

The recommendations, with endorsement from the state board, the commissioner, and the governor, found immediate and enthusiastic bipartisan support in the legislature. The next year, legislation incorporating the recommendations and providing enabling measures for a system of state-wide community colleges was signed into law by the governor. The colleges provided for in the New Jersey legislation are called "county colleges." The designation is significant. It reveals again the importance of the county as an administrative and governmental division in New Jersey.

The New Jersey statutes define a county college as "an educational institution established in one or more counties, offering programs of instruction not more than two years beyond high school. . . ."

A county board of freeholders, after proper determination of the needs of the county, may petition the State Board of Education for permission to establish a county college. If the state board approves (after conducting its own determination of the county needs), the freeholders may proceed by selecting a nine-member board of trustees for the new college, one member of which must be the county superintendent of schools. Selection of the board of trustees is made by the director of the freeholders with approval by the rest of the freeholder board. The term is for four years.

In addition to the trustees, who act as the governing body of the county colleges, the law calls for each county college to have a Board of School Estimate, composed of the director of the freeholders, two freeholders appointed by the freeholder board, and two trustees appointed by the board of trustees. The Board of School Estimate determines the annual outlay both for capital and operating expense. Having such a board for the county colleges is in accord with New Jersey school practice.

Provisions of the Law

The plans for financing the new institutions reveal a marked similarity to the New York State community college system modified to harmonize with the traditional functions of county government in New Jersey. The costs of capital outlay will be shared on a fifty-fifty basis by state and county. The operating expenses will be borne by state, county, and student. The law sets a maximum of $200 per equated full-time student as the state's share toward operation of the college. This will require the major operating costs to be borne by the county and/or student. Although the intent is to require the student to bear some part of the cost of tuition, there is no such requirement in the law, and it is possible, although not likely, that the county could bear all the operating expense. It is hopefully expected that in most of these colleges the student will pay an annual tuition not in excess of $250.

The county colleges will operate in accordance with standards and regulations established by the State Board of Education. Personnel of the county colleges will be eligible for membership in the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund. State authorities will determine and certify to professional qualifications, establish standards and requirements for degrees and certificates, determine tuition, and set up regulations for fiscal supervision and auditing.

It is interesting to observe that two or more counties may join together in the formation and operation of a single county college. Since it is anticipated that some of the less populous counties will not be in a position to sponsor colleges of their own at once, this measure will enable a degree of cooperation to permit regional facilities to be established at an early date. The law also provides that an existing county college may accept students on a reimbursement basis from any county not having its own county college.

Both Academic and Technical Courses

The New Jersey county college law specifically refers to the function of these institutions to include both college transfer work and "technical institute type programs." Surveys which have been taken throughout the state show that a need exists for both academic and technical courses. Consequently it is anticipated that most county colleges, as they come into existence, will provide comprehensive offerings from the start. Citizen groups active in promoting the passage of the legislation emphasized New Jersey's need in both areas.

What is the present status of New Jersey's county colleges? Not one has yet opened its doors, but if interest and activity in the various counties is any indication of things to come, New Jersey will soon be joining the growing ranks of the junior college states. Of the state's twenty-one counties, four have county college boards of trustees and are planning campuses; three more have been approved by the State Board of Education to establish and operate a county college; another six have requested the permission of the state board to establish and operate a county college; and four counties are in the process of making local studies which must precede the request to establish and operate such a college. Only four counties have taken no official action on the county college.

In each county where a study has been made, the reaction of the citizens, of business and industry, of labor unions, of educators, has been most favorable. It should also be noted that the formation of these new colleges has been assisted by representatives of private colleges and universities. This has been an important consideration in a state where a tradition of independent and denominational higher education runs strong. Representatives of private colleges played an important and constructive role in the original committee that recommended the new institutions to the state. Thus the planning for the new system of colleges has meant a marshalling of New Jersey's resources in higher education and a manifestation of a spirit of unity refreshing to observe in a state which has so many times in its past neglected its educational capabilities.

It is expected that the blueprints for the first county colleges will become reality in some counties by the fall of 1966. Some counties have already pleasantly discovered that fortunate circumstances can facilitate their planning. For instance, three counties have received offers of land. Another county will take over an extensive reservation (equipped with buildings, hospital, and even swimming pool and golf course!) soon to be vacated by the United States Army.

This kind of development is infectious, and it may be presumed that citizens in some of the other counties, pricked by local pride (of which there is much within the counties of New Jersey) will begin to look about to see what they can do for their own localities. This reaction manifests again the strong feelings of local identity in New Jersey education, a sentiment which some Westerners may find difficult to appreciate. This localism, although sometimes too provincial and segmented, does have its virtues, not the least of which is its capacity to engender the old college spirit in the home town boys. At best this can be a wholesome kind of competition through which the New Jersey communities can heartily support the cause of higher education.

A Companion Bill

A word should be said about a companion bill which became law at the time the new county college legislation was enacted. Reference has been made to the transient emergency junior colleges of the 1930's, of which only Union and Monmouth survived when federal support was withdrawn and World War II occurred. Since that time Union has continued to operate as a two-year college under independent auspices, working closely with the schools of its county and providing at-home college training for many young men and women of its area. Monmouth has expanded into a four-year college, although it still operates a separate and substantial two-year program in its junior college division. Recognizing the long service these institutions have given to their county communities and consonant with an expressed intent not to duplicate existing facilities, the legislature, with approval from Governor Hughes, has made it possible for these two institutions to fit into the pattern of the new county colleges. They are eligible for the county and state matching aid in operating costs. Union County has already appropriated funds for a tuition assistance program at Union Junior College.

For constitutional reasons they cannot participate in public aid for capital needs. It is possible that because of this arrangement allowing for the use of existing facilities at these two institutions, Union and Monmouth counties will go ahead with the formation of county colleges with emphasis in the technical programs, assigning the academic programs to the existing two colleges which already provide accredited college transfer programs.

The county colleges appear to be on their way. A majority of the counties are preparing reports preparatory to asking permission to establish these new colleges. There has been a practically unanimous expression of support for them. With an exploding population New Jersey has urgent need of these colleges. We could, with every confidence, predict a fast and wholesome growth for New Jersey's newest colleges were it not for the fact that the state, for the past decade, has been postponing action to update an antiquated system of taxation. At the last election a tax and fund-raising proposal by the governor was soundly defeated by referendum and now a solution to the state's mounting fiscal problems must be worked out by a legislature and governor of diverse political persuasions.

This does not mean that the first county colleges to be approved by the state will not be able to get under way. Out of general appropriations for the coming budgetary year a sum of approximately $4 million has been requested for matching monies to the county colleges for capital expenses. But what is at stake is the long-term development of the county colleges, and Rutgers, the state university, and the six state (teachers) colleges. Unless the decision is made to adopt a broad-based tax, either a sales or income tax, or a combination of these, New Jersey will be woefully unprepared to cope with the estimated doubling of the state's college population by the year 1970. In the past, New Jersey has led the nation in the proportion of its high school graduates "exported" to colleges outside the state. In the years ahead this deceptively simple solution to an enduring problem will not be applicable. The other states will have closed their doors.

Proponents of the new system of junior colleges confidently expect that these institutions will bring the opportunity of higher education to thousands of students in New Jersey who might otherwise be denied the college experience. They see the technical programs in these county colleges as the best solution to the serious shortage of technicians in the state's mushrooming industries. They see the new colleges as important and valuable cultural assets to the counties of New Jersey.

Too often now great companies like Humble Oil and Bell Telephone find it necessary to look outside the state for the recruitment of certain types of skilled technical personnel. Too often plants considering a location in New Jersey go elsewhere after realizing our scarcity in technicians. Atlantic City looks forward to the college in Atlantic County as a means of both strengthening and stabilizing the economy of a community almost wholly dependent on a resort economy. Ocean County is counting on its college to attract more of the chemical and electronic companies which have started to move away from the congested metropolitan areas.

Excitement and Eagerness

Any plan with so much potential to change or modify the picture of higher education—and indeed, the social and economic picture of a state—must include some elements of danger against which proper safeguards are essential. To emphasize local or county control as much as these institutions do contains its dangers. The trustees must be residents of the county whose college they serve. This was done, of course, to assure that those in control would be sensitive to local needs. Freeholders will have a splendid opportunity to serve their counties well by selecting dedicated men committed to the highest ideals of civic service. It would be most regrettable if political considerations downgraded these appointments to the level of partisan choice or party plums. To their credit, the freeholders of New Jersey, through their state association, have already given serious consideration to establishing qualitative criteria for these appointments.

Another word of caution should be expressed concerning the latitude of local control and policy.

Standards of excellence can be maintained by common adherence to state requisites, audit practices, and so on. It is good that the legislation gives the State Board of Education this authority, and it is hoped that the board will exercise this authority effectively. Ample protection must be provided, for example, for the college faculty member who finds himself under pressure from some local organization in a matter involving academic freedom.

Yet, new as New Jersey's system of two-year colleges is, and mindful as we are of the pitfalls and problems, many of them financial, we sense something new and promising in the excitement and the eagerness of all different kinds of groups—junior chambers of commerce, citizens' committees for education, service clubs, P.T.A.'s, the League of Women Voters, both major political parties, and educators throughout the state. And it takes a lot to stir old New Jersey, celebrating, last year, its 300th anniversary as one of the original thirteen colonies.

Those of us who have been associated with the two-year college movement feel sure that, properly established, adequately financed, and correctly administered, these exciting young institutions will add a dynamic energy to New Jersey's efforts to cope with the oncoming tide of college students.

Washington Shows New Life at Forty

By Frederic T. Giles

"Life begins at forty" has special meaning for Washington community colleges as the movement in this state celebrates its fortieth birthday. Although a careful examination today indicates strong and well-developed physical attributes, growth has been sporadic with periods of great expansion and plateaus of inactivity. At forty years of age the movement has its greatest strength and is headed into the greatest period of development in history.

During the past forty years, Washington community colleges have been involved in and have passed through nearly every phase of organization, administration, and finance that has characterized the history of the national junior college movement.

Today, Washington community colleges are comprehensive institutions organized as part of unified school districts, with various forms of administrative control, and financed primarily by state funds. As has been indicated this has not always been characteristic of the community colleges and elements of the description have not resulted from premeditated determination or design. How, then, did the present system come about?

Junior colleges in Washington were first conceived in 1915 as extended secondary education and were attached to existing high schools. This proved to be unsuccessful, however, and the junior college idea had to wait ten years before being taken up again.

Beginning in 1925 and continuing over a sixteen-year period, junior colleges were started as independent two-year colleges with no means of tax support. During this period state support was voted three times by the legislature, and vetoed all three times by governors of the state, before the first junior college bill was passed in 1941. By this legislation the colleges retained their independent organization but were given state financial aid.

In 1945, after several unsuccessful attempts to increase state support to junior colleges, the legislature passed an amendment which allowed the junior colleges to again become part of school districts and permitted the districts to receive state monies through the regular state distribution formula. Thus, Washington junior colleges became extended secondary programs for the second time with an assured source of funds for operation.

The community colleges are now organized and administered under an act passed by the state legislature in 1961 and amended in 1963 and 1965. This act, designating the institutions as "community colleges," was the first legislation passed in twenty years directly related to community or junior colleges. It was during this twenty-year period, however, that there occurred the greatest expansion of new junior colleges, growth of existing junior colleges, and development of comprehensive programs and physical plants designed for community colleges. In essence, the 1961 law reflected many of the practices and developments of this twenty-year period. It also incorporated the recommendations of the 1960 Report of the Interim Study of Education by the Washington State Legislature.

One of the strongest recommendations of this report was: "That the orderly and controlled expansion of junior colleges constitutes a major means by which certain critical needs of post-high school education can be met."

As a result of this legislation and previous development, there are now seventeen community colleges operating in Washington, with five more authorized to begin operation by 1967. Seattle School District, the largest in the state, which has not had community college education, will begin in September, 1966.

The state legislature has retained control of the number of community colleges by restricting the amount of funds and the number of new colleges that can be built. Authority for allocating the new colleges and establishing regulations for the distribution of state funds rests with the State Board of Education. The state board has developed excellent procedures for the consideration of new colleges through the use of district advisory committees and surveys, regional advisory committees and regional studies, and a state advisory committee with statewide studies and surveys. The result is a state plan for the development of community colleges which can be put into effect only as monies are appropriated by the legislature.

State board regulations for establishing new colleges give preference to comprehensive institutions but allow for specialized institutions on a professionally sound basis. This is consistent with the definition in the Legislative Act of 1961:

> *A community college shall be an institution established with the approval of the State Board of Education and maintained and operated by a school district, offering two years post-high school curricula of general education or vocational education, or both.*

During the past fifteen years, every one of Washington's community colleges has designed and constructed a new campus, or is in the process of designing one specifically planned for the community college program. These new plants have been financed by monies from the state and by local district funds with the state providing an average of 60 per cent of the funds. Prior to 1948, public-supported colleges were housed in any available temporary facilities. New colleges being established now must indicate the ability to provide facilities before they are authorized to operate.

Community college operating budgets are funded primarily from state sources which provide approximately 80 per cent of the revenues. The remainder comes from student fees, which, by law, cannot exceed $210 per year for state students, or $480 annually for out-of-state students. This amount includes a required annual tuition of $60 for resident and $330 for nonresident students.

Before 1963, the budgets were open-ended and monies were paid on a per-student basis for all those enrolled. The 1963 legislature eliminated this open-end feature by allocating a set amount of money for two years, which cannot be exceeded regardless of enrollment. Other financial changes included in the 1963 amendment were: the separation of the budgets of the colleges from the school district budgets; the separation of accounting and allocation of funds for colleges from the school districts; and the stipulation that state monies so allocated be used exclusively for the colleges. Monies for community colleges come from state sources because there is a constitutional amendment which prohibits the property tax from exceeding forty mills without a special note. The forty mills is allocated to other governmental agencies.

Community college development in Washington is least adequate in the highly populated urban areas. Until 1961, it was unlawful to use tax monies for community colleges in counties which had established institutions of higher education. This restriction was written into the 1941 law, when community colleges were considered only as the first two years of a regular four-year curriculum, and was instituted to avoid unnecessary duplication. As a result of this restrictive law, which took twenty years to change, community college facilities are lacking in the areas of greatest potential enrollment. This is best illustrated by a quotation from a 1962 report, "The Market for Community Junior College Service in King County, Washington."

> ***As a result of the study, we can therefore expect a junior college day-school demand of from 9,500 to 14,000 students in King County by 1965.***

This becomes more meaningful when it is realized that there were no operating community colleges in King County when the report was made and that the report indicates a need for ten community colleges in the region by 1975. Presently there are three colleges operating on a limited basis in the county and none in Seattle which has a public school enrollment of over 100,000, and which will have 50-55 per cent of the total potential enrollment. Three of the five colleges authorized by the 1965 Legislature are in King County. Thus, plans to provide community college education for the area are developing rapidly.

All Washington community colleges are organized as parts of regular school districts under the Unified District Plan. At present there are no alternative methods allowed by law. This is a subject of much interest, however, and the center of debate among educators, legislators, and other citizens. Many important factors and restrictions in the state affect or prevent an objective consideration of organization. Some of these factors are restrictive tax laws, organization of governmental units, population distribution, school finance, inadequate school district boundaries, vested interests, and the lack of strong pressures and concerted effort for study and change. As a result, no one method of organization and administration appears to include the attributes and resources necessary to answer the basic questions and concerns of any group, let alone the diverse groups.

Many observers and students of organization seem to feel that the best procedure would be to have permissive regulations which would allow use of the best type of organization for each college. Thus it would not be necessary to require the same type of organization for community colleges in various settings in the state. Allowances could be made for differences that have significant implications for the proper development of strong colleges.

As in the past, many bills were introduced in the 1965 session of the legislature, dealing with the organization and administration of community colleges. It was observed that next to redistricting, the community colleges received the greatest attention of the legislators. Both the house and the senate approved similar but not identical bills which would have established separate community college districts; however, due to pressures of time, they were unable to work out satisfactory procedures for implementing either bill or any acceptable compromise version. Later, when the legislature was forced into an extraordinary session, a bill was enacted which contained three provisions that will have a profound effect on community college education in Washington.

First, the new law established the principle of community college districts by stating that "there shall be created to manage the affairs of each community college, whether presently existing or hereafter to be established, a community college district." Second, it required a comprehensive study as the basis for establishing a statewide plan by directing the Superintendent of Public Instruction to prepare and submit to the 1967 legislative session a proposal that would implement the principle of community college districts.

Finally, the law clarified the role of the community college president by stating:

"During the period from July 1, 1965 to July 1, 1967 the president of each community college *may* be held directly responsible to the board of directors of his school district. Thereafter he *shall* be held directly responsible to the board of trustees of his community college district, except in those districts where community college service areas and common school district boundaries coincide."

Cooperation among educational agencies has been a strong force in the development of the community colleges. Research is carried out cooperatively between the State Department of Education, the Washington Community College Association, the universities and the community colleges.

A recent research symposium delineated the various needs for research and study in community colleges and established procedures for orderly accomplishment. This symposium was a cooperative effort by the State Office of Education, the Washington

Community College Association, and the two state universities. Another example of cooperative effort is a uniform enrollment form and a centralized record and statistical service of the State Office of Education for all state community colleges.

Washington community colleges have established themselves as a necessary and integral part of the post-high school educational program. As in the readjustment and realignment of education programs and institutions, there are genuine differences of opinion about problems and concerns regarding community college development which necessitate continued study, research, and adjustment. Nevertheless, the community colleges are here to stay; they will continue to make a major contribution to the educational program of the state, and they have and will continue to have general support of the citizens, the educators, the politicians, and members of business and industry as a result of the educational services they perform.

It has been said that more citizens are familiar with, and involved in, planning, developing, and carrying out the programs of the community colleges than any other phase of education in the state.

The Next Forty Years

"Life begins at forty," but we are told that life after forty is dependent on the life led before forty.

I believe the forty-year-old community college program in Washington has a bright future based upon a successful, though difficult, past. However, the bright future is dependent upon the ability to make necessary refinements in administration, organization, and finance; to accommodate an ever-increasing oversupply of students without diluting the programs; to maintain the characteristics, attributes, and services which have made the community colleges successful; and to be creative and responsive to the educational role given to or assumed by the community colleges rather than imitative of educational roles given to or assumed by other kinds of institutions.

Continued development and improvement will be more difficult. Complacency and a feeling of acceptance and "having arrived" will have to be fought. But the next forty years should see the culmination of many dreams envisioned by the community college pioneers during the past forty years.

Fifty Years of Community Involvement in Michigan

By Philip J. Gannon

Fifty years ago a community, six part-time faculty members, and forty-nine students made a decision concerning a new type of education for Michigan. From this beginning in 1914 has developed a system of twenty-four community colleges serving over sixty thousand people throughout the state.

It was appropriate in 1914 that Grand Rapids Junior College should limit its initial offerings to the traditional classical disciplines. This college fitted the times and met the needs of its community. Today Grand Rapids Junior College and the other twenty-three community colleges have developed or, as newly established districts, are developing unique programs for their communities and for the needs of the state and the country. The new role for Michigan community colleges has emerged as the state, once predominantly rural, has become predominantly industrial.

Because education in the United States is a function reserved for each state, it is important to record how Michigan community colleges have gone through the process of change. Some states have taken a position that central control and financing should remain at the state level with varying degrees of citizen participation. Michigan's tradition has been that local control, delegated by the state, and citizen involvement at all levels of decision making, is a meaningful and lasting way to develop an educational system.

Consequently, over the years Michigan public community colleges have progressed by using a coordinated approach that involves the Department of Public Instruction, the legislature, the governor's office, and citizen groups. With this kind of commitment, progress has not always been as rapid or as clear-cut concerning overall state planning as may be found in states that centralize most decision making at the state level. However, the benefits from this more flexible position have allowed citizens and educational leaders the opportunity to make decisions and take responsibility for their actions. This commitment appears increasingly difficult to hold in a society that is changing rapidly and becoming more complex. Possibly for this reason, among others, the frequency of studies concerning the needs of the state regarding community colleges have increased along with the request that these groups report more detailed and definitive recommendations within a framework which allows for a maximum of local initiative yet which is sensitive to overall state planning.

During the last ten years, many studies have been completed in Michigan pertaining to recommendations for the growth and development of community colleges. Local communities have conducted citizen studies in communities throughout Michigan with the help of Max S. Smith, Michigan State University; Gerald W. Boicourt and Sigurd Rislov, Wayne State University; Raymond Young, University of Michigan; and Ferris N. Crawford, assistant superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction. These studies have led to the establishment of twelve new community colleges with over ten more on the verge of being established. At the state level, study committees and commissions have been appointed to make recommendations concerning the role and function of community colleges and to develop a coordinated state plan.

The superintendent of public instruction notes, in the biennium reports, that the following committees and commissions were established and took the following actions:

In June, 1956, the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education obtained the services of Dr. John Dale Russell, who was appointed to make a survey of higher education in Michigan. Staff Study Number I of this report, "The Community College in Michigan," was under the direction of Dr. S. V. Martorana. The final report by Dr. Russell had forty-five recommendations, eighteen of which pertained to community colleges. The main recommendations of this report concerned the organization, control, program, financial support, and the desirable locations for new community colleges.

In August, 1958, the Governor's Commission on Junior and Community Colleges, comprised of twenty-five citizens, made recommendations to the governor concerning the functions, control, organization, standards, financial support, relationships to other institutions, and needs of community colleges.

Also in 1958, the state superintendent of public instruction appointed the Post Twelfth Grade Community Education Committee. This committee had thirty-eight representatives and made recommendations concerning the location, legal structure, curriculum, and financing of community colleges.

In 1963, this committee published a bulletin dealing with the instructional program development for community colleges.

In 1961, the state superintendent of public instruction appointed a thirty-six member, six-county Community College Development Commission. This committee was appointed to study the needs of additional community colleges in the Detroit Metropolitan area, and to bring recommendations back to the superintendent, the governor, and the legislature.

In 1962, the state superintendent appointed a State Advisory Commission on Community College Development, requesting them to develop recommendations concerning the financing of community colleges and to conduct a comprehensive study of enabling legislation for community colleges.

In March, 1966, a vote is planned for Wayne County, which encompasses the City of Detroit. This vote will determine whether the City of Detroit and some of its suburbs will establish six new community colleges to serve this metropolitan area.

Council of Community College Administrators

Community college administrators in Michigan, after reviewing and discussing the John Dale Russell study and the governor's study in 1958, determined that it was advisable to establish a Michigan Council of Community College Administrators. This group meets regularly throughout the year and conducts a summer workshop to foster coordination between public community colleges and to function as a statewide coordinating group.

The purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To recommend to the state legislature the amounts needed for operation and capital outlay after reviewing on a statewide basis the financial requirements of all public community colleges.
2. To improve the administration of community colleges by exchange of information.
3. To inform the public about the purposes and functions of community colleges by distribution of brochures and special reports.

From these many local studies, commissions, and committees evolved a mandate for curricular changes, strengthening of financial support, and a clarification of function. It is not always pleasant to have citizens asking questions regarding finance and curriculum but it does stimulate those in public service to appraise their actions carefully.

The same type of citizen activity at a different level was beginning in regard to other segments of higher education, forcing the state colleges and universities, and in many cases the private colleges, to evaluate their services to the citizens of the state. Also during this period, the people of Michigan made a basic decision concerning the need for the calling of a constitutional convention for the purpose of revising the constitution of 1908. At the time of the writing of the constitution in 1908 community colleges were hardly an idea in the state and consequently were not mentioned.

During the time the elected delegates to the

Constitutional Convention of 1961 were meeting in Lansing, it was fortunate that documents and reports and well-informed representatives were available to them for consultation in forming a statement in the new constitution regarding community colleges. Aggressive lobbying on the part of Michigan community college administrators plus the interest of many citizens brought about the inclusion of Article 8, under Section 7 of the new constitution, which states:

> *The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment and financial support of public community and junior colleges which shall be supervised and controlled by locally elected boards. The legislature shall provide by law for a state board for public community and junior colleges which shall advise the state board of education concerning the general supervision and planning for such colleges and requests for annual appropriations for their support. The board shall consist of eight members who shall hold office for terms of eight years, not more than two of which shall expire in the same year, and who shall be appointed by the state board of education. Vacancies shall be filled in like manner. The superintendent of public instruction shall be ex-officio a member of this board without the right to vote.*

With this statement regarding community colleges in the constitution, some of the initial recommendations of John Dale Russell's study and other studies began to shape formally and legally the declared role of this segment of higher education.

Growing Financial Support

George Romney, who served as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, was a member of its educational committee. In 1962, he was elected governor of Michigan. The governor, out of long interest concerning education, served on the Detroit Public School Citizen Committee and throughout his campaign voiced his interest in the problems of education, particularly those regarding higher education. To gain interest for these ideas, he appointed a citizen's committee on higher education (commonly known as the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Higher Education). This committee completed their formal report to the governor during the fall of 1965. An interim report was produced by this committee with recommendations concerning the financing of community colleges, which was instrumental—with the cooperation of the legislature—in bringing about the greatest appropriations for community colleges in the history of the state. A total of $6,905,106 was appropriated for the operation of community colleges, allowing for $234 support for each full-time equated student. The capital outlay allocation was increased from $1.5 million to $4 million. Again in the 1965 legislative session support was increased to $275 per full-time equated student for a total of over $11 million for the operation of community colleges. The capital outlay remained at the $4 million level.

Over the last several years, the legislature has been requested to allocate 50 per cent of the capital outlay needs for community colleges. Although the allocation for funds for capital outlay and operations were increased significantly in the legislative seasons of 1963-64 and 1964-65 they were still less than what was requested for public community colleges in the state. It is anticipated that during the 1965-66 fiscal year Michigan community colleges will need to construct facilities costing over $25 million. One-half of this figure, or $13 million, was requested of the legislature.

Federal and State Acts

The median tuition for students in Michigan community colleges for the college year 1964-65 was over $180. It was felt that this tuition was too high and, consequently, the legislature was requested to allocate $300 for each full-time equated student. This increase for operational funds would allow the colleges to "hold the line" on tuition as well as diversity and improve curricular offerings. The Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee, with other educational groups, advocated during the 1964-65 legislative season a considerable increase in capital outlay and operational funds for community colleges.

Under the new federal acts for college facilities and vocational education, Michigan anticipates well over $4 million for capital outlay. These funds should allow, with the $4 million from the state, the opportunity for local community colleges to approach their capital outlay requirements for this fiscal year. At present, Michigan law limits the state capital outlay matching funds to community colleges to a maximum allocation of $600,000. Consequently, if the college is in the midst of a major building program its share of its capital outlay expenditures on a matching basis could be severely limited. Previous to this year, $500,000 was the upper limit, and as noted above, the legislature did change this to an upper limit of $600,000.

Contacts with the governor and the legislature indicate that there is a great deal of sympathy for the needs of community colleges and the necessity of long-range campus planning. It is anticipated that, with the help of the new State Board for Community Colleges, many of the problems of financing will be changed in a way beneficial to the needs of community colleges.

Undoubtedly, one of the most significant legislative acts in the history of Michigan, concerning community colleges, was put into effect during the 1963-64 legislative season. This act developed out of the concern of the people of Michigan that community colleges should play a significant and primary vocational training role in the fields of the health sciences, business, and technology programs.

In a speech given at the annual workshop of the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators in Traverse City on July 22, Dr. Ferris N. Crawford gave the following analysis of Act 237 of the Public Acts of 1964:

> *In its 1964 Session, the Michigan Legislature enacted one of the most significant community college statutes of its history. Encouraged by the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators, the Superintendent and Department of Public Instruction, the*

Michigan Association of Junior Colleges, and other organizations, the Legislature passed Act 237 which redefines the educational role of community colleges and specifies the supporting districts as charter units of government in accordance with Michigan's new Constitution.

In respect to the educational role of community colleges, this act:

1. Gives the community college the permissive authority to offer both collegiate and noncollegiate programs of education primarily (but not exclusively) for all persons above the 12th grade age level and primarily (but not exclusively) for those within commuting distance of the institution.

2. Removes the previous two-year limitations on the length of collegiate level courses which may be offered.

3. Specifically gives community colleges authority to grant diplomas including degrees known as associate degrees.

4. Restricts the community colleges from granting bachelor or higher degrees.

5. Expands the specified legal authority of a community college district so that it may now include area vocational-technical education programs in its curriculum.

6. Defines specifically the meaning of area vocational-technical education programs.

7. Gives the community college the authority to enroll students in an area vocational-technical program, those students being persons who have completed or left high school, who have already entered the labor market and need additional training, and under certain conditions persons who are regularly enrolled in the secondary school on a full-time basis.

In effect, the aforementioned provisions of the act extend the community college role both upward and downward on the educational continuum, while at the same time these retain the breadth and comprehensiveness of programs in terms of the needs of individuals and the society of which they are a part. Thus a student might attend a Michigan community college part-time while still enrolled regularly in a secondary school. He may be enrolled indefinitely, after graduation, in a community college program of a credit or noncredit type of any length. Or a non-high school graduate might be enrolled in a variety of educational programs of any length. But regardless of the length or comprehensiveness of any program completed by a student, in a community college, the act restricts the community college from granting to the graduate a degree higher than that known as the associate degree.

In respect to defining community college districts as charter units of government, the act:

1. Gives the electors of the district the authority to vote on the question of giving the board of trustees the authority to levy, for an indefinite period, a property tax rate for all purposes of the community college up to a rate of 5 mills ($5 per $1,000 state equalized valuation).

2. Gives the board of trustees the authority to issue bonds, in accordance with a defined formula, without an authorization vote of the electors, and to levy an annual property tax sufficient to pay the annual interest and principal payments for such bonds without a previous authorization vote by the electors.

With this change in the law, Michigan community colleges now legally will add to their traditional role of serving the academic needs of their community, through their transfer liberal arts curriculums, a strong commitment to vocational education.

During the last few years the Michigan Association of Junior Community Colleges and the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators have had to take several positions concerning the function of Michigan community colleges. Consequently, when Delta College requested of the state legislature that they be allowed to become a four-year college, these associations, as well as the Council of State College Presidents, opposed this action. This position was supported by the State Board of Education and Delta remains a part of the community college system in Michigan. During the 1964-65 legislative session, the state established a new, public four-year college for this area.

Toward a Statewide System

In the spring, 1964, the Michigan Association of Junior Community Colleges and the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators took a position regarding the University of Michigan's Flint Branch. At present, the Flint Branch offers only junior and senior courses. These two associations requested that the university not be allowed to extend offerings at the freshman and sophomore level on the campus of the Flint Community Junior

College. The Michigan Coordinating Council for Public Higher Education, composed of state college presidents and board members with a board and administrative representative taken from community colleges, appointed a committee of out-of-state representatives that has, in its report, substantiated the above position.

A newly formed association, the Michigan Association of Colleges and Universities (presidents of private and state colleges), has accepted as full members the deans and presidents of accredited Michigan community colleges.

It appears to the writer that the next several years will see development in Michigan of a system of community colleges within commuting distance of all the citizens of the state. This fast-evolving system leaves the important function of local control, allowing a community college to be unique and fit its particular community needs, under a state plan that will be balanced carefully to protect this position and the total interest of the state.

Ohio Joins the Club

By Charles E. Chapman

On September 23, 1963, they came by the hundreds.

A bright-eyed teen-ager from a middle class suburban community—hoping to be a nurse.

A serious young man from the central city—looking ahead to a career in electronics.

A tall, slender lad from out of the county—with an eye on law.

A blonde miss from a deprived neighborhood—dreaming of being a private secretary.

A retired WAC—planning a teaching career.

They came from all parts of the county, from all walks of life, from seventy-one of the county's eighty-two high schools, and from the well-to-do suburbs to the depressed areas of central Cleveland. There were youngsters and oldsters; they represented multiple creeds and colors. They were a composite of the complex urban community of which they were a part.

They came to enroll at Cuyahoga Community College, the first public community college to be chartered under Ohio's Community College Act of 1961. By the end of the first week of registration, more than 3,000 full-and-part-time students had enrolled. It was estimated at the time that an additional 200 to 300 were turned away because of a shortage of faculty and classroom space. It was probably the largest initial enrollment in the history of the junior college movement.

The Cleveland Press hailed it as "the miracle on 14th Street."

This auspicious beginning of the community junior college movement in Ohio didn't happen by chance. Numerous statewide studies going back to the early 1950's indicated a need for community colleges in the state. This feeling was climaxed on June 1, 1958, when three members of the Ohio Legislature, a businessman, the executive secretary of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, and a newspaper reporter huddled in a tiny office on Cleveland's public square.

"We're here to do something about getting a junior college in Ohio," said Ralph M. Besse, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company. Mr. Besse went on to say, "I'll do all I can to help, but it's up to you fellows to get a law so we can get started." He offered his good wishes and left for another meeting.

From that first informal meeting emerged the will to get something done for Ohio, and for Cleveland in particular. The legislators pledged their support at the coming meeting of the General Assembly. Evan B. Lloyd, executive secretary of the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education of which Mr. Besse was the chairman, pledged the commission's support. The reporter offered the support of his newspaper, *The Cleveland Press.*

During the fall of 1958 a bill was prepared, and in January, 1959, it was introduced to the General Assembly. It was enacted into law but was vetoed by Governor Michael V. DiSalle because of what he called "inadequate provisions" for the financial support of community colleges.

By this time the number of supporters of the junior college concept had grown considerably. Among the vocal and influential supporters were the Ohio Commission on Education Beyond the High School, the Ohio Interim Commission on Education Beyond the High School, and the Leagues of Women Voters.

An Unusual Day in the Legislature

Consequently, a similar bill was introduced into the legislature in 1961. This bill passed the house but failed in the Senate Committee on Education. A companion bill called for the establishment of technical institutes and fared better in the Senate Committee on Education. The day it was presented to the senate was one of the most unusual in Ohio's legislative history. As the bill was presented, Senator Frank King, the minority leader, jumped to his feet and moved to amend. He said, "Strike the words 'technical institute' and substitute 'community college.'" He did this at least a score of times while startled education committee members looked on. Senator King's amendments passed each time by one vote and within an hour Ohio had a community college law over some loud, but futile objections. Governor DiSalle, who favored the bill this time, signed it into law after some needed revisions.

In spite of numerous shortcomings in the law, the County Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, of which Cleveland is the county seat, decided to move ahead in the establishment of a community college. The commissioners felt that Cuyahoga County, with a population of 1.7 million and an industrial complex containing 70 per cent of all the types of industries listed by the U.S. Census Bureau, needed a public community college that was sensitive to the needs of the community. They wanted a low-tuition college that could help meet these needs by training, retraining, and upgrading personnel in such a complex industrial community, and could provide the first two years of a liberal arts program as well.

Consequently, the county commissioners voted the district into being and appointed a board of trustees of seven members in February, 1962. The board had the formidable task of obtaining answers to such questions as, "How does a public college get started without public funds or the authority to borrow them?" "How does a college board plan a program without a staff?" "How does a college get started with an inadequate law and in the absence of facilities, equipment, and curriculum?"

Although these problems seemed insoluble, the board was undaunted. A few weeks after assuming its responsibility, the board sought and received from The Cleveland Foundation $75,000 with which to study its needs and plan for the future. Concurrently, it asked for guidance from the American Association of Junior Colleges. Through that office, Dr. Leland Medsker, vice-chairman of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, was employed as a consultant.

Dr. Medsker assisted the board in surveying the county's 15,000 high school graduates of 1962. He also recommended that the position of director of planning be established and filled at the earliest practicable time. This suggestion was accepted and the writer was appointed to the position in July, 1962. He has continued as president since the college was chartered in December, 1962.

A Decision to Start—Somehow

In spite of the numerous questions that remained unanswered, the board of trustees resolved in August, 1962, to start classes in September, 1963, somehow. What at the time could have appeared to be a rash decision, proved to be far-sighted and profound.

To accomplish this goal the following acts were effected: A series of public hearings were held to determine the need for the college; a county-wide, socio-economic survey was conducted to learn the characteristics of the community to be served; questionnaires completed by 12,000 high school seniors were analyzed; and scores of speeches were given along with participation in dozens of radio and television programs. During his first sixteen months in Cleveland, the writer gave more than 200 talks and appeared on more than a score of radio and television programs. Board members probably exceeded this number of public appearances.

Everywhere personnel of the college turned they were received with enthusiasm. Individuals and groups representing every segment of the community pleaded with them to "get the college started as soon as possible." The board moved with renewed confidence. In the absence of public legal counsel, private counsel was employed. The law was rewritten to clarify its financial provisions authorizing the college district and the state to contribute both capital and operating funds to community colleges. Provisions were also included authorizing community colleges to offer technical-occupational subjects. A master plan for the college was prepared. It was approved by the State Community College Board on December 5, 1962, and thus the district became a college as well. The rewritten community college bill was presented in January, 1963, to the state legislature and was approved unanimously by all committees and both houses. It was signed by Governor James A. Rhodes in July, 1963. These amendments to the law established a firmer foundation for the development of community colleges in Ohio and assisted Cuyahoga Community College in reaching its announced objective to start classes in September, 1963.

Facilities

In the absence of public capital funds, the board of trustees sought additional private funds during the spring and summer of 1963 for the purpose of renting, renovating and equipping a facility for college classes. A total of $350,000 was raised and used for these purposes and for necessary program planning and augmentation of the staff. The college leased from the Cleveland Board of Education, for a dollar a year, a seventy-five-year-old elementary school that had been vacated since 1955 due to an urban renewal program that converted a blighted residential area to nonresidential use.

Monies were contributed by seventy different companies, labor unions, foundations, and individuals. This was the first time that the industries of Cleveland had been asked to donate to local public higher education, although their contributions to private colleges and universities have amounted to millions of dollars over the years. Trustees of the college promised that such a solicitation was a "one shot" plan that was necessary if the much-needed college were to start on schedule. This was also the first opportunity that a sizable and important segment of the public had to express its feelings toward the idea of a community college.

Contracts for refurbishing and equipping the leased facility were let in May and work was completed in October, 1963. This facility gave to the college twelve classrooms, including three science laboratories. The original gymnasium was converted into a library, and the kitchen became the office of student personnel. The original wood shop started life anew as a cafeteria. All fixed and movable equipment placed in this temporary facility was designed and installed so that it could be removed to permanent facilities later on. From the outset the facility has been used 85 per cent of the time from early in the morning until late at night.

To accommodate an increase in students from 3,000 in 1963 to 6,000 in 1964, an additional 60,000 square feet of space was leased. This was augmented by additional space in 1965.

Due to a shortage of time and personnel, and the absence of facilities, equipment, and money, courses in the area of technology were restricted during the first year to a number of single and multiple offerings. This void was filled in part for the academic year 1964-65, when the college initiated sixteen two-year degree programs. All of these are the result of close cooperation with more than 150 citizens who represent sixteen advisory committees. The programs include building construction technology, business, dental hygiene, electrical-electronic technology, industrial supervision, law enforcement, mechanical technology, medical assisting, nursing, and secretarial science. It is anticipated that an additional six to eight new associate degree programs will be started during the school year 1965-66.

Relationships with Other Schools

From the outset of the forming of the district, the board and administration at the college have been sensitive to their relations with other schools—public schools, private and public colleges, and universities.

Between April 15 and June 15, 1963, college personnel visited sixty of the eighty-two high schools in the county. In May, the college was host to 100 high school counselors. Through these endeavors and others, more than 1,000 freshman students were counseled during the summer of 1963. Radio and television programs and the distribution of literature were used to tell the story of the college during the short time available.

In spite of the fact that the community college concept was new to many senior college and university personnel in Ohio, relations with them were cordial from the beginning. Discussions and correspondence during the early spring and summer of 1963 resulted in acceptance of Cuyahoga Community College's credits at the leading senior institutions throughout the state. Liaison with these educational institutions has continued.

Financial Status

The first public monies received by the college were from the state. These monies, amounting to $220,000, were appropriated for operating expenses for the year 1963-64. They were received six weeks prior to the beginning of classes and amounted to $146 for each full-time equivalent student computed by the following formula:

$$\text{F.T.E.} = \frac{\text{Total student credit hours of enrollment}}{\text{30 credit hours}}$$

Effective in 1965, state financial support was increased to $200 per full-time equivalent student. For the biennium 1967-69 the Board of Regents plans to recommend a further increase to $250 per full-time equivalent student.

Since November, 1963, voters have approved three separate college tax levies. The November, 1963, election was the first time the voters of the county had an opportunity to express their feelings toward the college. They approved it overwhelmingly. This levy assured the college sufficient operating funds for the upcoming five years. Due to an emergency caused by a taxpayer's suit filed against the state (the expected source of capital money needed by the college to equip additional science and technology laboratories) the voters were again asked to approve a levy for the benefit of the college. The levy was approved by a 58 per cent majority on May 5, 1964.

In May, 1965, the voters again reacted favorably toward the college when they approved a five-year levy in the amount of $17 million. Along with state support, the college now has sufficient operating funds to carry it through the 1969-70 school year and capital funds with which to build a $22.5 million facility. The master plan for this first campus calls for a facility to accommodate 6,000 full-time equivalent day students. The location of the proposed campus consists of 40 acres in downtown Cleveland. It is at the focal point of public transportation in and out of Cleveland and is within a 30-minute drive of approximately 1.8 million people.

As part of an urban renewal project, land for this campus was acquired by the college at one-fifth its market value. Because of the need for additional educational services, other campuses are contemplated by the Board of Trustees.

The Law Today

The major provisions of the law as it exists in Ohio at this time are as follows:

1. One or more counties with a population of 70,000 at the preceding decennial census qualify as community college districts.
2. Districts may be initiated by a simple majority vote of county commissioners. Subsequent to the appointment of the initial board, the only continuing authority and responsibility of the commissioners is that of filling vacancies and making appointments as terms expire.
3. Community colleges in Ohio are a part of the system of higher education.
4. Community colleges and technical institutes and state-supported senior colleges and universities

are planned and coordinated by the newly established Ohio Board of Regents.

5. Community colleges have the right of eminent domain and other legal authority commonly associated with public agencies.

6. Curriculum authority includes liberal arts, adult education, and technical-occupational programs.

7. There are no credential or certification requirements for community college faculty personnel.

8. Tenure and other personnel benefits are a matter of local option.

9. Financial support includes operating funds from tuition (to be set up by the local boards), local taxes, and state appropriations. Capital funds may be received from local taxes and state appropriations.

The proportional financial responsibility of the local district and the state has not been stipulated in the law; nor is there a continuing local millage for either capital or operating expenses. Each has to be voted as needs develop. Capital and operating support from the state has to be negotiated biennially.

What is currently a good law would be an excellent law if its financial provisions were amended to provide planning money for newly created community college districts, and include a formula setting forth the proportional local and state responsibilities for the capital and operating costs of ongoing community college programs.

Plans and Expectations

It is the announced objective of Cuyahoga Community College to develop a comprehensive countywide community college with emphasis on teaching, counseling, and course offerings—to include the arts and sciences, but with a great deal of emphasis on the area of technical and semiprofessional curriculums.

Enrollment at Cuyahoga Community College increased from the 1964 fall enrollment of 6,500 to approximately 9,800 in 1965. To accommodate this increase, the college leased an additional 30,000 square feet of office space in nearby buildings. A demographic study conducted in the late summer of 1962 indicated that the college could have 10,000 to 13,000 full-time day students in less than ten years. Experience since the college started in 1963 indicates that this was a conservative estimate.

The early and continuing progress of Cuyahoga Community College encouraged other counties to start community college districts. Lorain Community College initiated its instructional program last fall with approximately 1,000 students. Approval by the voters of Lorain County of a tax levy in 1963 provided the college with capital and operating funds. Augmented by federal and state appropriations, Lorain Community College has been able to move quickly in the establishment of an ongoing instructional program; further, capital funds from the sources referred to above have permitted the college to move ahead with this building program. Contracts have been let for the first few buildings of a campus designed to accommodate 5,000 students.

Mahoning, Montgomery, Lake, and Columbiana counties have established community college districts. Inquiries from other counties are being made with increasing frequency. The progress of county community colleges in Ohio, during their short history, has gone a long way toward showing the state legislature and the state government that their decision to enact enabling community college legislation and to support ongoing programs was based on sound judgment.

While there is still a laissez-faire attitude on the part of some in Ohio who are responsible for the planning and coordinating of higher education, regarding the respective merits of the comprehensive community college, university branches, and separate technical institutes, the distinct advantage of the comprehensive community college is being more widely recognized as the practical and economical approach to filling a large part of the everwidening void between the high school diploma and the baccalaureate degree.

114

It May Happen in Alabama, Too!

By Walter A. Graham

The state of Alabama and, more particularly, its governor, George C. Wallace, have been in the front pages news for many months. Regardless of one's feelings about the governor, his name will probably go down in Alabama history as the one man most responsible for the big push in junior college education in Alabama in this decade.

The Wallace administration came to office on January 14, 1963, and the biennial meeting of the Alabama Legislature was held in May of the same year. One of the very first pieces of business for the legislature, according to the wishes of the new governor, was a bill dealing with junior colleges and trade schools. Despite much opposition from some legislators, many school men (including administrators of state-owned and private senior colleges) and others, even before the regular school appropriation bills were passed, the governor was successful in having three acts passed.

New Legislation

Acts No. 92, 93, and 94, approved at 4:10, 4:11, and 4:12 p.m. on May 3, 1963, provided for an Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority with the governor, the director of finance, and the superintendent of education as directors of the corporation. One of the acts provided for an increase of 1 cent in the current beer tax, 4/7 of the increase to be used to pay the principal and interest on bonds, not exceeding $15 million for the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority.

One of the acts further provided that no more than $1.5 million "shall be expended by the Authority with respect to any one trade school or junior college." An additional provision was that ". . . no funds of the Authority shall be expended for the acquisition of sites or existing buildings . . ." and "No such trade school or junior college shall be built on a site other than one donated to the Authority." (Incidentally, while none of the acts specifically mentioned the number of institutions to be established, it was generally understood there would be ten, this number being determined by dividing the total of $15 million for all by $1.5 million, the maximum amount to be spent for one college).

With such statutory enactments loaded with available funds, at least for new buildings, it is not difficult to understand how and why requests were received from each of the sixty-seven counties in Alabama to establish either a junior college or a trade school in either the county seat or some other community in the county. To deal with the numerous requests, the governor appointed a committee of nine citizens to receive them and make recommendations to the Alabama State Board of Education concerning the ten possible sites. The nine-man committee included representatives from Auburn University and the University of Alabama (Alabama's largest four-year institutions), a high school principal, superintendent of a large city public school system, a member of the Alabama State Board of Education, and several other prominent citizens.

Following the report of the special site committee, the governor announced that "ten new junior colleges and twelve new trade schools would be built throughout Alabama in an unprecedented fifteen-million-dollar program." The locations ran from far north to deep south and from east to extreme west, taking in both big cities and small, rural communities. Four were set aside for Negroes and the balance were for white students. Subsequently, an announcement was made by the governor that four more sites had been selected and, in addition, one existing college was accepted by the State Board of

Education, the definite date of taking over by the state to be dependent upon the state legislature making available the necessary operating funds.

After the sites are selected and the buildings constructed, the Alabama Trade School and Junior College Authority Act provides that ". . . the State Board of Education shall assume the responsibility for operating and maintaining . . ." the new institutions:

> *The State Board of Education, upon recommendation of the State Superintendent of Education, shall: Make rules and regulations for the government of such additional educational institutions; prescribe the courses of study to be offered and the conditions for granting certificates or diplomas; appoint the president of each such additional educational institution and, upon the president's recommendation, appoint the members of the faculty and affix the tenure and salary of each; direct and supervise the expenditure of legislative appropriations for the use of such additional educational institutions; accept gifts, donations, devises, and bequests of money and real and personal property for the purposes of this Act; disseminate information concerning and promote interest in such additional educational institutions among the pupils of public schools; and make such rules and regulations as the board shall deem advisable for the government of such additional educational institutions.*

Plans have gone forward on the drawing boards of the Alabama State Building Commission (as charged under the enabling legislation) for the main administration buildings, including classrooms, library and dining facilities. There are no plans at present for dormitories, auditoriums or gymnasiums. The governor has stated publicly on several occasions that most of the new junior colleges and trade schools will be in operation by the fall of 1965.

Existing Junior Colleges

Alabama has not been without junior colleges as indicated by the fact that the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, formed in 1958, is composed of six member colleges. (Four of these colleges are active members also of the American Association of Junior Colleges.) Marion Institute, at Marion, with

Colonel Paul Robinson as current president, was founded in 1842 and is the oldest junior college in the state. Although it is an independent institution, it receives contributions from the State of Alabama as does Walker College at Jasper, which was founded as an independent institution in 1938; it has had only two presidents, the current one being Dr. David Rowland.

The four other junior colleges, listed in the order of the date of establishment, and giving location, denominational affiliation, and current presidents are: Southern Union State Junior College (formerly Southern Union College), Wadley, 1922, Congregational Christian (now The United Church of Christ), Dr. Walter A. Graham; Snead College, Boaz, 1935, Methodist, Dr. John Tyson; Sacred Heart College, Cullman, 1940, Catholic, Sister Mary Lourdes Michel; Alabama Christian College, Montgomery, 1942, Church of Christ, Dr. Rex Turner. Daniel Payne College, for Negroes, was established in 1889 at Birmingham by the African Methodist Episcopal Church; Dr. Howard D. Gregg is president.

The purpose of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, as set forth in its working rules, is "to promote the common interest of the junior colleges of Alabama." The purpose is to be achieved "through representation in other agencies interested in education; through coordination of efforts on behalf of the junior college; through collaboration in exchange of resource material and personnel and through public relations."

In the more than six years of the association's life, it has sponsored an annual music festival, an annual meeting in conjunction with the Alabama Education Association (new officers are chosen at this time) and workshops for faculty and staff members. Meetings have been held on each of the various campuses which are located in widely separated parts of the state. The institutional membership dues are $25 per year.

The most recent venture of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges has been the preparation and

3

dissemination of a brochure about all of the present member Alabama junior colleges. Following the collection of certain pertinent information from each of the member institutions and the careful editing by a committee of three presidents, the presidents or their representatives met and pooled their lists of friends and supporters, eliminated the duplications and sent the brochure out. The purpose was to make as many people in the state as possible aware of the values and contributions of the junior colleges and also to appeal for wider support.

The Alabama junior colleges are not a part of the Alabama Independent Colleges although negotiations are presently underway to make this a reality. The current president of the Alabama Independent Colleges is a former president of one of the Alabama junior colleges so there is some basis to assume that he will take the lead in having his colleagues consider including the junior colleges.

When the present incumbent was notified that he had been elected the president of the Alabama Association of Junior Colleges, he said that the association "has a real opportunity in the coming year in view of the large number of junior colleges which the state is organizing. The present association anticipates with great pleasure working with the leaders and the communities as these new state-owned and operated junior colleges come into being."

Yes, the state-supported junior college movement may really get off the launching pad one day, even in Alabama!

Late Developments

Fourteen state-owned and controlled junior colleges opened their doors in September, 1965; ten of them are new and four of them have previously been in existence, one for two years and another for forty-three years.

The enrollments vary from a low of 142 to a high of 993, the average between 300 and 600, the total being 5,476 in 1965-66 and an estimated 10,000 in 1966-67.

Classes are held in churches, high schools, abandoned hospitals, and various civic buildings. Contracts have been let for all of the new buildings, some of which were completed and occupied in the fall of 1965.

The State Board of Education has set the tuition charge of $45 per student per quarter or $135 for the year; this is for Alabama citizens or residents while out-of-state students will pay $100 per quarter or $300 for the year.

The legislature, following the leadership of Governor George C. Wallace and State Superintendent of Education Austin R. Meadows, has already made available, in special and regular sessions, a total of $37.4 million for Alabama junior colleges and trade schools.

The Alabama Junior Colleges now operate a fleet of buses, the number varying from four to twelve per college, that follow scheduled routes on an express basis, without charge to students.

The time for the countdown for junior colleges in Alabama has passed and beginning of the first orbit is very near!

Crossroads in Texas

By Kathleen Bland Smith

The thirty-two public junior colleges in Texas stood at a crossroads in 1965.

The direction of their development was discussed exhaustively—and altered—as the 1965 legislature considered the sweeping changes recommended for state-supported colleges by the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School.

Texas junior colleges will no longer continue to grow as they always have—without plan or pattern, based simply on the desire and the energy of the people in the local district which they serve.

They have become part of a master plan for higher education in Texas, with course offerings determined by a strong, central coordinating board for public education beyond the high school.

The program proposed by the governor's commission, and sponsored by the governor in the legislature, was passed into law by the legislature in the spring of 1965, the changes to become effective the following September.

In September, 1965, Governor John Connally appointed the eighteen-member Co-ordinating Commission for Higher Education. The commission, in turn, has appointed an acting commissioner and staff, and the new program is in operation.

Texas junior colleges are under the same control as four-year colleges for the first time, and they will receive increased state aid. An important innovation is the establishment of a contingency fund which will be used to help rapidly growing colleges for the second year of the biennium. However, because of the big increase in enrollments, this fund will pay only about 25 cents on the dollar, according to Dr. Thomas M. Spencer, president of the

Texas Public Junior College Association. In several cases, junior colleges with rapidly growing enrollments have been educating a high percentage of their students for whom no state aid has been collected because of the Texas system of appropriating funds for a two-year period. The contingency fund will give these junior colleges relief.

The effect of the new system on junior colleges cannot be judged at this time; however, most educators look on the changes favorably.

The concept of a two-year college, with its special functions, began in Texas. Decatur Baptist College, Decatur, Texas, founded in 1898 is considered by many to be the nation's first college founded specifically as a two-year college. Before then, however, another college in Texas taught a two-year course in business administration: Blinn College in Brenham, then a Methodist college and now a public junior college.

Blinn started as a Methodist prep-school and high-school-level academy, Mission Institute. College-level work was started when a wealthy Methodist minister, Christian Blinn, offered to donate money for a college building if the college would admit women, and offer college-level business administration, both radical ideas for 1896. After much discussion, the college board of trustees agreed to both requirements, and a two-year college course was started in Texas.

Other church groups started two-year colleges in the early 1900's, some of which, like Clarendon and Weatherford, have since become public junior colleges.

The state also started several two-year colleges, chiefly the "normal" type of college for teacher training. Since these were always fully state-supported and never locally controlled, they have not been considered part of the junior college movement in Texas. Each is now a senior college.

Growth of Public Junior Colleges

Not until 1920 was the first locally controlled public junior college founded in Texas: El Paso, which was shortly discontinued. In 1922, the first permanent public junior college was founded: Hardin College, organized by the Wichita Falls Independent School District. Meanwhile the junior college idea had been developed by other states, notably California, which had at least eighteen public junior colleges before Texas' first permanent one was established.

In many ways, besides being the first one, Hardin was typical of the development of junior colleges in Texas. First, the junior college "grew up" from high school. So did twenty-four other public junior colleges, most of which later separated from the parent school district. Six of them, however, still remain under control of public school districts.

Furthermore, several junior colleges continued to "grow up" into senior colleges, among them Hardin, which developed into Midwestern University in 1961. South Park Junior College became Lamar College of Technology in 1951; the University of Houston, which had maintained a public junior college and privately supported upper classes and graduate school, became fully state-supported in 1963. In 1965, two more, San Angelo and Pan American in Edinburg, became senior colleges. Residents in many a junior college district are asking. "When will our junior college become a four-year college?"

This propensity for further development and the public acceptance of the role of the junior college as an adolescent senior college caused the state authorities to say that after Pan American and San Angelo became senior colleges, no other junior college would be permitted to "grow" into a senior college. Instead, junior colleges should fulfill their functions as two-year colleges, enlarging on their two-year technical training programs and adult education as well as the traditional two-year academic core.

Essentially, this is the function of the junior college as envisioned by the governor's commission.

Financial Support

Another aspect of the development of junior colleges in Texas has been the financial relationship between the two-year colleges and the state. The earliest junior colleges had no legislative recognition and no state support. From 1920 to 1928, eighteen junior colleges were created by independent school districts, with one discontinuing soon after founding. In 1929 came the first legislative recognition, when the seventeen colleges operating within the framework of the independent school districts were recognized by a validating act passed by the Forty-First Legislature. The same act also provided for creation of other junior colleges as separate entities in county-wide districts, multicounty districts, or union school districts governed by independent, elected boards of regents.

Seven new colleges were voted under this act, but three of them were never activated. By 1940, Texas had twenty-two public junior colleges in operation and three dormant districts. However, these colleges were still financed entirely from local funds.

This lack of adequate financing shows up best in the accreditation records of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Twenty-five Texas public junior colleges are now members of the Southern Association; seventeen of them were accorded membership after 1950—after state aid gave them adequate financing, and more ability to pay qualified faculty.

State aid came in 1941, when the Forty-Seventh Legislature agreed to pay $50 per full-time student. Aid was paid for 6,498 students that first year, but twelve new districts were established between 1940 and 1948, although one was never activated. By 1948, state aid had been increased to $100 per full-time student and was paid for 8,822 full-time students in thirty-three public junior colleges.

Since 1948, the number of public junior colleges has not materially changed. Those junior colleges which became senior colleges were replaced by new junior colleges. But enrollment relentlessly increased in 1962-63 to 30,322 full-time students in thirty-three public junior colleges, and the relationship between the state and its junior colleges changed as the legislature came to grips with its higher education problem.

First. the organization of the state Department of Education changed from an elected state superintendent of schools to an elected state board and an appointed superintendent. Although state colleges were put under a Texas Commission for Higher Education, junior colleges, because of their beginnings as outgrowths of public schools, were kept under the newly created Texas Education Agency, supervisor of the public schools. There was no relation between development of programs for the state's senior colleges and the state's junior colleges. However, each junior college has been free to develop programs which benefit its area, and through accrediting agencies, standards of course offerings have been maintained.

Second, enrollment jumped from 11,931 full-time students in 1952 to 27,296 in 1962, and 48,000 are forecast for 1970. At the same time, resistance to further taxation developed in some local districts. Three proposed junior college districts were turned down by the voters from 1949 to 1961, and the first one approved since 1949, San Jacinto College in Pasadena, encountered stiff opposition. Clearly, a financial crisis was coming, although state aid had increased to an average of $243 per full-time student by 1963.

Third, although the state obviously felt an increasing responsibility for financing public junior colleges, districts never knew from biennium to biennium what proportion of junior college costs the state would be willing to pay. The legislative council report of 1947-49 advocated that the state pay all of the instructional costs of junior colleges, and for that biennium the legislature financed junior colleges on the same basis as two fully state-supported junior colleges, Arlington and Tarleton. Then junior college enrollment began to climb, as did senior college enrollment, and the proportion of state aid to local aid dropped considerably. One of the legislative aims of Texas public junior colleges this year was to convince the legislature that the state should pay for all instructional costs, leaving local money free for the large building programs that will be necessary, for auxiliary programs, for administration, and for maintenance. A recommendation to this effect was made by the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School. It would cost $22 million in 1965-67 and $28 million in 1967-69. This compares with actual state aid of $8,304,139 in 1963.

Another aspect is that the state is becoming interested in pushing technical and vocational education in the junior college. College-level technical and vocational courses were given state aid for the first time two years ago, when the legislature appropriated $228,000 as the 25 per cent requirement to receive federal funds under the National Defense Education Act. From this 1963-1965 program of approximately $912,000 came satisfactory results. Before 1963, twenty-two colleges had some type of technical and vocational program. Now, all thirty-two have these programs, and the original twenty-two programs have been expanded.

Junior colleges are asking the state for approximately $3 million for the 1965-67 biennium as the 25 per cent contribution toward a $12 million program in vocational and technical education. This amount has been recommended by the governor's commission. It is obvious that a tremendous expansion in college-level vocational and technical programs will result if the legislature approves this amount. The relationship between the state and the junior colleges has changed materially.

The Coordinating Board

The key proposal was the establishment of a coordinating board, named the Co-ordinating Commission on Higher Education, with eighteen members appointed by the governor, which would have full authority over all higher education in Texas. One division of this board would be the Committee on Junior Colleges, while others would be concerned with colleges and universities, research and graduate programs, fiscal and management services.

Among its powers are the following:

The board should coordinate each level of education from the junior college through the university and:

1. Reject or accept institutional proposals for modification of role and scope.
2. Determine the number, character, and level of operation of each public educational institution beyond the high school.
3. Recommend to the legislature that, as a matter of policy, no junior college should be changed to senior college status, but if a senior college is needed, it should be recommended by the board.
4. Determine which institutions shall be classified as junior colleges, senior colleges, and as universities, and determine when institutions are operating beyond the scope defined for them.
5. Recommend to the legislature tuition policies for public junior colleges, senior colleges, universities, and vocational and technical programs.

The board should also assume responsibility for:

1. Directing the phase-out of obsolete, unnecessary, or inadequate programs or degrees, and creating new degrees and programs in any given institution.
2. Encouraging and developing new programs in technical and vocational education in the junior colleges as the needs of technology and industry may demand.
3. Approving a basic core of general academic courses to be offered at all junior colleges during the first two years of collegiate work which, when transferred, would be accepted among member institutions of recognized accrediting agencies on the same basis as if the work had been taken in the receiving institution.
4. Encouraging the consolidation of existing junior colleges where necessary to facilitate more effective programs and to assure higher quality in these programs.
5. Encouraging and developing increasing numbers of junior colleges.

Enactment of these recommendations gives the coordinating board powers now held by the local boards of regents and by the legislature itself. The local boards will continue to exist, under the proposals, and will operate within the framework of the board policies adopted by the coordinating board. Also, each junior college will offer academic, technical, vocational, terminal, and adult educational programs, and will be permitted to have a limited role and scope depending upon the needs of its locale.

The public junior colleges have come the full circle: from establishment to fill a need in the higher education structure with no connection or aid from the state, through recognition without aid, then to state aid administered through the public school agency, and finally, to inclusion in a master plan for all higher education in Texas with all instructional costs to be borne by the state.

A $45 million bond issue was passed by Dallas, May 25, 1965. The Tarrant County election for the district, board, and operating tax was held and an $18 million bond issue passed August 7. Galveston County, Killeen, Beeville, and Waco have voted for new districts. Eight more district elections are pending.

It is ironic, as the new era of junior colleges in Texas is dawning, that the nation's oldest junior college, Decatur Baptist, will cease operation at the end of this year. It will be consolidated with Dallas Baptist College. The tradition which it established still goes on in eleven private and denominational junior colleges in the state, and in the thirty-two vigorous, public junior colleges which are receiving increasing public recognition and state support as an essential factor in the solution of the higher education problems of Texas.

Pennsylvania Opens The Door

By A. Martin Eldersveld

When Governor William W. Scranton signed into law the Community College Act of 1963, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, after decades of unfortunate delay, accepted its responsibility to provide equality of educational opportunity for all of its citizens.

For generations this third largest state had been concerned, in the field of higher education, with a minority of its high school graduates. Recent studies reveal that less than 33 per cent of the state's high school graduates enter college, and that Pennsylvania ranks forty-ninth in the nation in the amount of state expenditure per capita of population for institutions of higher education. As one citizen perhaps exaggerated:

> *Pennsylvania, like many Eastern states, has traditionally held that only the economically and academically able are entitled to higher education. In such belief it continues to live in the past, refuses to recognize its obligation in this modern society to educate all of its people, and continues to experience a tragic loss of human resources.*

But the picture is now changed. Four public community colleges are now in operation, three more have been approved, standards and regulations have been provided, and a state office has been created to direct further development. The period of waiting is over. A statewide system of community college education will become a reality.

Throughout the years, Pennsylvania has been frequently advised as to its educational needs. In

1948, Leonard V. Koos and S. V. Martorana, engaged by the Joint State Government Commission, submitted "A Community-College Plan for Pennsylvania." Again, the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in 1957, and the Governor's Committee on Education in 1961, encouraged the development of community college education. Unfortunately, however, as has been true in other states, the advice of experts often goes unheeded.

Continued evaluation of Pennsylvania's educational system by persistent and visionary educators repeatedly underscored the urgency for action. To them the picture was not satisfactory: One public and eight private universities with twenty-two extension centers, fourteen state colleges with six extension centers, ninety-five private colleges and seminaries, and eighteen private junior colleges—an abundance of 164 institutions, most imposing prohibitive tuitions and highly selective admissions. And, at the other end of the educational spectrum, limited vocational offerings within the context of secondary education, questioned by some as low in enrollment and therefore inadequate to the need. Obviously, a critical educational gap existed with a relatively large number of the youth of Pennsylvania being denied higher education opportunity.

But all of this is now history. Pennsylvania, though many years late, is now on the move. In its study of the educational system, the 1963 Governor's Committee of One Hundred for Better Education reported that Pennsylvania's high schools graduate nearly 20,000 potential public community college students every year; existing two- and four-year colleges do not serve all the people; the state suffers an incalculable loss of trained intelligence to its economy and culture; and three successive sessions of the General Assembly received proposed legislation but took no action mostly for purely political reasons. The committee's recommendation: "Pennsylvania needs a new kind of college—the public community college. . . . Many politicians, it appears, need a good bit of education in this particular subject." The result was the adoption on August 24, 1963, of enabling legislation, Act 484, and development since that time has been very encouraging.

There has been a growing recognition of need and increasing local enthusiasm for the public community college as a partial solution to Pennsylvania's educational problems. On October 1, 1963, the governor appointed a seventeen-member State Board of Education including a Council for Higher Education. They are highly qualified and dedicated individuals who delegated responsibility for providing leadership in this area to George B. Mohlenhoff, deputy superintendent for higher education. To date, seven community colleges have been approved (Harrisburg, Philadelphia, Williamsport, Bucks, Montgomery, Butler, and Allegheny Counties). It is expected that the governor will authorize four public community colleges each year and that a statewide system of thirty may accommodate the educational needs of the state.

University of Michigan Professor Norman C. Harris served as a consultant to the state during the winter of 1963-64 to prepare standards, criteria, and guidelines for the public community colleges. And, in August of 1964, the writer was appointed as director of the newly created Bureau of Community Colleges. Alvin Eurich, Sidney Tickton, Earl McGrath, and Donald Dauwalder were engaged to conduct state studies for higher education, state colleges, and vocational education. Columbia University Professor Ralph R. Fields, together with his associate, Hans Flexner, assumed responsibility for developing a master plan for public community colleges by June, 1965.

Pennsylvania's First

A milestone in Pennsylvania education occurred in February, 1964, with state approval of the Harrisburg Area Community College. Over a year of research by Consultant John G. Berrier and an executive committee from sixty-one out of eighty-five districts within a three-county area had organized the college. Elected in March was a fifteen-member board of trustees under the chairmanship of a local attorney, Bruce E. Cooper, who is referred to locally as the "dynamo" behind the scenes. Maurice C. Overholt, formerly registrar at Flint Community Junior College in Michigan, was appointed in June as business manager and dean of student personnel services. Also in June, Clyde E. Blocker, an administrator and author of national reputation, formerly dean at Flint Community Junior College and more recently professor of junior college education at the University of Texas, assumed the presidency. In these men, and many others, the Harrisburg Area Community College had found the knowledge and experience necessary to quickly and expertly develop final plans for Pennsylvania's first public community college.

Operating in temporary facilities, two naval reserve buildings, the college opened its doors in September, 1964, with an enrollment of 429 students, 252 in the liberal arts transfer program and 177 in the applied studies (civil and electronic technology, secretarial science, and business administration) all under the tutelage of forty-three full- and part-time faculty and staff. On July 1, 1965, Hershey Junior College merged with the Harrisburg Area Community College.

Concerning matters of finance, for its first year a budget of almost half a million dollars was approved for the Harrisburg Area Community College. Operational expense in accordance with state law will be shared on a one-third ratio by the local districts, the state, and the students. Cost per student was set at $810, thereby establishing tuition of $270 for the first year. The institution is financed through a capital expenditures appropriation of $100,000 from the sixty-one districts for each of three years, in addition to an expected 50 per cent expenditure from the state. Recently, the Harrisburg Area Community College acquired as its permanent site 145 acres in beautiful Wildwood Park and expects to have its new campus completed by September, 1967.

The Community College Act of 1963 provides "for the creation, establishment and operation of public community colleges, granting certain powers to the State Board of Education, the Council of Higher Education, and the Department of Public Instruction; authorizing school districts, county boards of school directors, and municipalities to sponsor community colleges; authorizing school districts and municipalities to levy certain taxes; providing for reimbursements by the Commonwealth of certain costs and expenses, and making an appropriation."

Legislation Highlights

Highlights of the enabling legislation are many but may be briefly enumerated as follows:

1. The community college is wisely defined as an institution of higher education, its chief administrator as president.
2. College control is vested in an autonomous board of trustees, its sponsor empowered to levy local taxation.
3. Operational expenditures are shared equally by the community, the state and the student.
4. Capital expenses are shared equally by the state and the community
5. The instructional program is broadly comprehensive including preprofessional liberal arts and sciences, semiprofessional business studies and technology, trade and industrial education, developmental training and adult education.
6. The state board of education is empowered to approve or disapprove plans and to adopt policies and minimum standards for the establishment and operation of public community colleges.

Pennsylvania is on the threshold of an exciting new venture. Interest is high and intention sincere. There is a genuine conviction among educators, legislators, and public alike that the youth of the commonwealth shall no longer be denied higher education opportunity. As evidence of this interest, in addition to the colleges already approved, at least thirty communities are presently investigating this new opportunity and are, therefore, in various stages of community college development.

Problems remain, but resolution is apparently assured. The 1965 legislative session dealt with a recommended 50 per cent capital outlay state obligation, the only major obstacle to community college progress. Proponents of the community college hopefully await more favorable legislative action to assure continued community college progress.

Appropriations have been made for additional staff in the Bureau of Community Colleges so that consultative services may be extended and the state policies and standards for public community colleges may be administered.

A Bright Future

And finally, education in the state is now under the direction of a very capable board of education, one dedicated to the philosophy of equality of educational opportunity and one which recognizes the inadequacy of the existing system to implement this philosophy. In accepting this challenge, the board has directed the preparation of master plans to define the roles of existing institutions, to outline the needs of the future, and hence provide the necessary guidelines for an urgent educational reorganization. The board is aware that a sound educational system requires, among other factors, the selection of institutions which provide for a broad spectrum of educational needs beyond high school, a refusal to compromise in order to placate vested interest, and the mandatory appropriation of necessary monies. In this dedication the board has accepted the public community college as an important segment of higher education, one which can adequately fill the existing gap between the high school and the four-year institution.

Thus, the future looks bright. Although the "door" is not yet completely "open" and therefore indoctrination as to the nature of the truly comprehensive community college continues as an important need, Pennsylvania has essentially altered its educational philosophy—one which now accepts that progress very largely depends upon equality of educational opportunity and therefore "judgments of differences in talent cannot be judgments of differences in human worth."

Full Partners in California's Higher Education

By Henry T. Tyler

California pioneered in the development of junior colleges. No less than eleven[1] of the state's seventy-four junior colleges are observing their fiftieth anniversaries during this decade. They continue to flourish, and to grow spectacularly, both in numbers and in enrollment. But recent developments in other states are suggesting possible new solutions to some of California's current junior college issues.

The state got an early start toward what became junior colleges when Anthony Caminetti, in 1907, obtained passage of a legislative act that authorized high schools to offer certain post-graduate courses of collegiate level to their graduates.

In 1921 an act authorizing establishment of school districts to operate junior colleges gave new impetus to the effort to make post-high school education more readily available.

Numerous subsequent actions of the legislature regarding extent of state support and other aspects of junior college operation have been taken. Prominent among these have been (1) the firm inclusion of junior colleges within the state's constitutional definition of free public education; (2) numerous acts increasing the amount (but not the percentage) of state support for junior college operation; and (3) recent acts, beginning in 1961, which, for the first time, extended state funds to the junior colleges to assist with the provision of physical facilities.

Several important studies of higher education in the state have been made at the instance of the legislature. In particular, these have been the 1932 Suzzallo Study, the 1947 Strayer Study, the 1954 "Restudy," and the 1960 Master Plan Study. All have included the junior colleges.

The Master Plan Study of Higher Education in California was mandated by the 1959 session of the legislature because of the belief that pressures for more institutions of higher education and possible needless duplication of programs might strain the state's resources unless brought under some control. Many of its major recommendations were embodied in the resulting Donahoe Higher Education Act.

Among other things, the Donahoe Act defines the state's provision for higher education. It reads:

> *Public higher education consists of (1) all public junior colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law; (2) all state colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law, and (3) each campus, branch and function of the University of California heretofore and hereafter established by the Regents of the University of California (Education Code, section 22500).*

Another section states, in part:

> *The public junior colleges are secondary schools and shall continue to be a part of the public school system of this State . . . (Education Code, section 22650).*

As a result of these statutes, junior colleges are legally both part of the state program of free public education (by earlier constitutional and statutory definition also) and of its public higher education. Some people are confused by this situation; others see great virtue in it. This double legal status is true also of the California state colleges.

The Donahoe Act also defined the functions of each of the three public segments of higher education. Those of the public junior colleges are:

> *Public junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the 14th grade level, which instruction may include, but shall not be limited to, programs in one or more of the following categories: (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (2)*

vocational and technical fields leading to employment; and (3) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the associate in arts or associate in science degree (Education Code, section 22651).

A third outcome of the Donahoe Act was the establishment of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, a statutory body of fifteen persons. It is composed of three representatives each from the one private and three public "segments" of higher education, plus three persons representing the public at large. Though its functions are limited to an advisory capacity except for the authority to require reports from the public segments, it is charged with advising the governor and the legislature concerning "support levels" for the public segments.[2]

Prominent among recommendations of the Master Plan Study not included in the Donahoe Act were several that are having considerable effect upon the junior colleges. These have been major concerns of the Coordinating Council, and of the California Junior College Association:[3]

1. The study called for gradual increase in the *proportion* of state support for current operation, then estimated at about 30 per cent of cost, to 45 per cent, to be reached by 1975. This remains an unrealized objective, though the legislature has, by resolution, endorsed it.

2. The study recommended that the state share in the cost of constructing junior college facilities. Passage in November, 1964, of a state bond issue assures at least $50 million for this purpose, in addition to $30 million previously allocated. The 1965 session of the legislature also adopted a continuing program of capital outlay aid to junior colleges.

3. The study called for the California state colleges and the University of California, through more selective admissions' policies, to reduce the proportion that lower-division enrollments bear to total undergraduate enrollments by approximately one percentage point a year. By 1975 some 50,000

students, who might otherwise have entered the lower division of one of the other public segments of higher education, would be diverted annually to the junior colleges. Both the University of California and the California state colleges are now committed to this plan by their respective boards.

Coordinating Council Activities

The Coordinating Council has been engaged in the process of assuring that the above recommendations from the Donahoe Act and the Master Plan Study, as well as numerous others affecting all of the state's program of higher education, are followed.

As part of its activities, the council has embarked on a study of the junior colleges, seeking to assist in resolving problems currently critical. In mid-November, 1964, as part of this study, the council convened a three-day seminar at which selected representatives of the State Board of Education, State Department of Education, University of California, California state colleges, Junior College Leadership Program, California Junior College Association, and Junior College Section of the California School Boards Association, met with junior college faculty and administrative representatives and members of the council staff. Papers prepared in advance presented numerous problems and issues with particular focus on the following areas:

1. Local control and types of organization
2. State-level control and supervision
3. Financing of current operations

It is hoped that outcomes of this seminar and the related council study will bring more rapid progress toward resolution of the problems considered.

Types of Junior College District Organization

Historically, junior colleges in California have operated under four types of control, although in each a local governing body has been the responsible authority. These types of controls have arisen because of the succession of legislative acts under which junior colleges could be established. They are:

1. High school districts maintaining junior colleges

2. Unified districts maintaining junior colleges

3. Junior college districts having a common administration (board of trustees and superintendent) with a high school or unified district

4. Junior college districts having a separate board of trustees.

Before the enabling act of 1921, all junior colleges in the state were obviously of the first or second type. As recently as 1958, of fifty-six districts maintaining junior colleges, less than half were of the fourth type. As of July 1, 1965, sixty-five districts were operating a total of seventy-five colleges, counting the "San Diego Junior Colleges" as one. Of these, fifty-one were colleges operated by forty-seven districts whose boards had junior college responsibility only. Two more separate districts have been authorized by the voters, these to become fully effective on July 1, 1966. Voting will be held early in 1966 on the formation of at least two, and possibly four, more new junior college districts.

There is, in some quarters, strong feeling that every junior college district should have a governing board responsible solely for junior college governance. That there is a notable trend in this direction may be seen by the figures just cited. Certain groups in the state are currently advocating legislation that would require this organization for all junior colleges. Proponents of unified (kindergarten through junior college) districts see advantages in that form of organization, and resist mandatory change. Still others argue for local option in determining the pattern to be followed. The 1965 legislative session ordered interim study of this problem, but changes in district boundaries and possible new legislation make it probable that the number having separate boards will rapidly increase.

Within the last five years, significant legislation has been passed relevant to district organization:

1. The minimum population and wealth bases for projected new junior colleges have been raised. Except in situations of isolation, at the discretion of the State Board of Education, formation of a junior college district now requires a potential of 1,000 in average daily attendance within two years, and an assessed valuation per A.D.A. of at least $150,000.

2. Junior college districts are now the only type that may be authorized to maintain junior colleges.

3. It is the intent of the legislature that all high school districts rapidly come within districts maintaining junior colleges.

4. By September 15, 1967, studies seeking to achieve the legislature's intent are expected to have been made in every county. After that date, the State Department of Education is required to make any such studies not earlier made by county committees. Already few of the heavily populated areas of the state are still outside of districts that maintain junior colleges, and at least 90 per cent of the high school graduates live in a district that maintains one or more junior colleges.

Current Developments and Issues

Multicollege Districts: These recent changes in legislation, coupled with rapid enrollment growth, are bringing quick development of multicollege districts. For about fifteen years Los Angeles has had seven junior colleges under one board, a board that also is responsible for the elementary and high schools and a separately organized adult program. The Contra Costa Junior College District has operated two colleges since its inception in 1950. These have been the only multicollege districts, though Hartnell, Long Beach, and Oakland have operated colleges having more than one campus. At present, however, at least ten more districts expect to be operating more than one college by 1970-71, and additional colleges are planned by both the Los Angeles and Contra Costa Districts. These expansions, plus new districts still in the study or planning stage, make it likely that by 1970 the state will have at least ninety public junior colleges in operation.

Recognizing that, as these multicollege districts —often large both in enrollment and in geography— increase, new problems of organization and operation must be faced, the new Los Rios District in northern California recently had a one-day workshop of board, administrative, and faculty representatives, with several outside consultants, to study these problems. Another such workshop was held in the fall.

Growth: California, in common with most of the rest of the nation, finds its higher educational enrollments skyrocketing. One-year increases in junior colleges of as much as 35 per cent are reported. In the fall, 1965, semester, the statewide growth over the preceding fall was 11.7 per cent. The number of full-time students, those carrying twelve or more units, is reported as 188,870, which is a gain of 23.9 per cent over Fall, 1964. More than 270,000 additional students were carrying lesser loads for credit. In addition, some 70,000 students were enrolled in noncredit classes, and a great many of the junior colleges conducted numerous music, drama, or speakers' series that attracted large numbers of persons. The problems of financing and constructing facilities for so great a student population, and of recruiting well-prepared and highly competent staff members who understand the comprehensive community-oriented junior college, are many indeed.

What is "Collegiate"? It is worth noting that the legal definition quoted above makes all offerings of the public junior colleges higher education, and therefore "collegiate." Not all Californians have yet recognized this fact. Still believed by many are the three "myths" described by Dale Tillery, assistant director, Junior College Leadership Program, University of California, Berkeley, in the paper he prepared for the Coordinating Council seminar already mentioned. They are:

Myth 1—Only those courses which are recognized by universities for transfer purposes are college-level.

Myth 2—There is some some sort of absolute standard for college courses which is determined by the nature of the subject taught, and which can be readily determined and applied regardless of the students being taught.

Myth 3—Education for immediate employment is somehow less collegiate than education for work which requires transfer to another institution.

Tillery goes on to note that some "see the Master Plan as a mandate to 'raise standards' in junior colleges and to eliminate courses from the curriculum which are 'less than college-level'." He proposes the following as ideas essential to meaningful definitions of those terms:

"Standards": The only meaningful definition of "standards" in education is determined by the quality of teaching and the resources for learning. Badly taught courses have low standards whether they are at the freshman or graduate levels. Excellently taught courses have high standards whether they are concerned with remedial English or quantum physics . . .

"College-level": Those courses which concern themselves with the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work, or as they seek greater freedom and refinement of mind, are of college-level. In California such courses are to be determined by the characteristics of students who are to be educated in the various segments of a differentiated system of higher education . . .

Thus, in California, the entire spectrum of courses offered in the comprehensive junior college is higher education.

State-level Supervision and Service: An issue which, at present, is causing much discussion concerns junior college supervision at the state level. Since the first junior college was established, the appointed State Board of Education has been the state agency responsible for their supervision, maintenance of standards, and approval of courses. Its authority derives from statutes in the Education Code, and the board's regulations are placed in a section of the Administrative Code. Its authority is limited, and, in general, its regulations have developed from needs felt over the state at the operating level. The State Department of Education, serving in part as staff for the board, in part as a semiautonomous agency, under the elected state superintendent of public instruction, has performed the necessary functions of obtaining reports, maintaining records, apportioning funds, and providing consultant services for all the levels of public education, including the junior colleges.

Because the state board's agenda are often full, mostly with items not relating to junior colleges, and because responsibility for the state department's services to junior colleges has been scattered widely among the department's 1,800 staff members, some desire has recently been expressed for legislation that would give junior colleges a state board of their own, with necessary state-level staff. Partly to counter such a move, and partly to improve services, the state superintendent is, at present, seeking to make a number of internal changes in the department in order to bring together all of the persons with responsibility to junior colleges. Also, a junior college committee of the state board has recently been named, and is taking great interest in becoming more familiar with junior college needs. Whether these changes will forestall the move for separation remains to be seen.

From the foregoing it may be judged that the junior college situation in California is, to say the least, a dynamic one. With the junior colleges in California enrolling half a million full and part-time students this fall, in both graded and ungraded classes, with an annual growth rate of between 10 and 20 per cent, with a goal of attracting annually hundreds of instructors who love to teach and who believe in the open door to higher education opportunity, it is small wonder that those who know this field best call it the most exciting element in education today.

---

[1] Bakersfield, Chaffey, Citrus, Fullerton, Gavilan (originally San Benito), Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, Santa Ana, Santa Rosa, Fresno.

[2] With passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act by Congress, the C.C.H.E. has been designated as the "State Commission" for California. It thus acquires an administrative function not originally contemplated for

it. By action of the 1965 legislature, the council will have six members representing the public, making its total membership eighteen.

[3] All public junior colleges and several private junior colleges in the state hold institutional membership in this association.

Progress and Plans in the Empire State

By S. V. Martorana

Even the oldest of the twenty-eight public community colleges in New York State is younger than this year's freshmen. The first public community college law was enacted, and the first community college established, in 1948—only sixteen years ago although some antecedent efforts to launch the movement date back ten or more years beyond this period. These institutions in New York, therefore, have operated only about one-quarter of the time that community colleges have in such other states as California, Illinois, Michigan, and Texas. The two-year technical colleges, which are integral parts of State University of New York and limited to occupational programs only, have a slightly longer history but only six now remain in their original form. Increasingly, they are becoming complementary institutions to the locally controlled community colleges in the overall community college movement in the state.

Yet, within their relatively brief history, the New York public community colleges have made striking progress. In the opening of the 1964-65 academic year public two-year colleges enrolled 39,749 full-time students, an increase of more than 9,500 over the preceding fall. A slightly larger number of persons—40,073—were attending on a part-time basis. Put another way, three out of ten of all full-time students in public, higher educational institutions in New York State in the fall of 1964 were in public two-year colleges, and almost four out of ten of all part-time students in public colleges and universities were in the two-year institutions.

To serve a college population of this size requires a substantial investment in human and material resources, varying greatly in size and complexity with different college locations and communities served. One metropolitan community college must accommodate nearly 3,000 full-time and about twice as many part-time students while another, in a rural area, has an enrollment of under 300. Only by encouraging diversity of this kind can the community college needs of the state be met. That progress is being made is seen in the fact that now in New York State 85 per cent of the population resides within daily commuting distance of a public two-year college.

These are the facts. The buildings can be seen, their costs calculated, and the students counted. It is harder to measure precisely the effect of community colleges on the force and direction of higher education in New York State, but an idea of this is seen in the nature of their programs.

Contrary to the way that public community colleges emerged in many other states, the first impetus for those in New York developed primarily from an emphasis on and a sense of need for greater opportunity for youth and adults to qualify for employment in technical and semiprofessional fields. Community college programs, therefore, are required by law to include occupational curriculums as well as ones equivalent to the first two-year liberal arts courses in four-year colleges and universities.

The list of current offerings in public community colleges directed to employment is as extensive as the kind of advanced skills demanded by New York State employers. The programs reflect the needs of business and industry, and are responsive to industrial change and movement, as is evident from the number and variety of courses offered. Fields of study range from agriculture and aircraft operations through administrative, accounting, marketing, retailing, and secretarial aspects of business; banking, insurance, and real estate; fashion and textile design; such health science fields as nursing, dental hygiene, medical laboratory, and optical technology; to heavy industrial occupations like automotive, chemical, construction, electrical, highway, and metallurgical areas.

Because of the early and historical emphasis on occupational training, community colleges in New York State have had larger enrollments in these programs than in the liberal arts and science curriculums. A trend reflecting recent encouragement of greater comprehensiveness in the direction of more arts and science programs is seen in the declining proportion of full-time enrollment in occupational fields. The proportion of students enrolled in such fields over the past decade has been as follows: 1953-54—95 per cent; 1958-59—87 per cent; 1960-61—75 per cent; 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65—68 per cent. The static percentage of enrollees in occupational programs over the past three years suggests a leveling off of the trend downward.

During the last three years full-time enrollments in the community colleges in absolute numbers leaped forward greatly from 25,465 in 1962-63, to 39,749 in 1964-65. It is evident, therefore, that during the past three years absolute increases in enrollment in the occupational fields are occurring proportionately as fast as those in the liberal arts and sciences. Close attention is being focused on this topic, however, to identify any significant changes as soon as they might appear.

The chief impact of community college development in New York, therefore, is similar to that in other states where these institutions have been established on a widespread basis. The base of educational opportunity has been widened not only in terms of numbers of people reached but also with respect to the range of interests and abilities identified and trained to useful and productive purposes.

Acceptance Becomes Trust

Passage of the New York State community college law in 1948 was the culmination of more than thirty years of struggle, by advocates of the junior college idea, to gain official recognition and approval in the state.[1] From 1948, when that struggle ended with success and final acceptance of the community college, to the present time may well be considered the period of "test and demonstration of the institution." Many critical eyes were focused on it over the sixteen years, 1948-1964. Some were clearly doubtful and antagonistic, others hopeful and helpful.

The doubters and skeptics gave way to the advocates of the institution and the great social, economic, and cultural forces demanding educational services of the community-college type. There is now in New York a strong unanimity among educational leadership groups in the view that community colleges have a clear, important, and very large mission to perform within the total educational program of the state.

In New York, the Board of Regents is the supreme educational agency. Its constitutional and statutory responsibilities encompass all levels of educational services, public and private. Early in 1964 the regents published and distributed widely a basic policy statement on the "comprehensive community college" and its role and scope of service.[2] This seven-point policy affirms the educational soundness of community colleges offering in a single administrative structure the five services of university transfer, occupational, general education, adult education, and guidance programs. Moreover, it asserts that community colleges, having functions different from both the high school and upper division collegiate levels of education, should be viewed as distinct and separate from both. Procedures for doing so while preserving a high degree of articulation and coordination with both levels were called for and indicated. The regents also commend State University of New York, which has responsibility for statewide supervision of the community colleges within overall, statewide, educational policies set by the regents, for having encouraged and implemented community colleges throughout the state.

The regents, by virtue of a statute enacted in 1961, are also responsible for developing each year, starting with 1964, a statewide plan for the orderly development of higher education. The law stipulates that, in doing this, the regents must draw upon the master plans of State University and City University. In addition, the plans of the 167 privately controlled institutions must be taken into account. Although the regents had undertaken several actions toward state-wide planning before 1961, the new statute gave a new, strong impetus to coordinated planning.

A Mission in Future Plans

All segments of the large scale, statewide, planning program set in motion by the 1961 law give the community college a permanent place. City University, in its 1964 master plan,[3] State University, in its planning document,[4] and the regents, in their 1964 Statewide Plan which incorporates the approved proposals in the plans of the two public university systems,[5] all make the community college a basic plank in their platforms for long-range planning. Their statements show beyond doubt that not only is the community college an accepted part of the higher educational enterprise but one on which critical reliance is put in planning for the attainment of post-high school educational goals.

The plans, however, show more than this acceptance and trust. They indicate also that the structure and programs in effect in community college education in New York State need to be strengthened. While the record of achievement, as already noted, has been great, the experience of sixteen years discloses basic deficiencies which need to be corrected so that the impressive record can be continued.

The proposed extensions and improvements in community college education fall into two large categories. One is the expansion of institutions, programs, and scope of services which can be fulfilled within the powers now legally vested in New York State higher educational authorities, and the other is the set of proposals for legislative changes to strengthen the structure and financial basis of community college education. The first classification of proposals includes many detailed and extensive changes which can best be seen within the context of the four reports in which they are presented. Attention here, therefore, is concentrated on the proposals for legislative changes included in the regents' 1964 statewide plan.

Strengthening the Legal Base

Stated topically, the recommendations in the regents' 1964 statewide plan which are relevant to strengthening the legal base of the public community colleges in New York State are these:

The establishment of a program of "Regents' Junior Year Transfer Scholarships" for community and junior college transfer students who demonstrate superior promise for continued college study while attending community colleges or privately controlled junior colleges.

Continued encouragement of an articulated and coordinated development of both area vocational programs under local public school auspices and community college programs leading directly to employment as technicians and semiprofessional workers. The State should continue to make full use of all available resources for preparing technicians and semiprofessional workers, and such complete utilization should emphasize coordinated planning and development at both local and state levels.

That the Education Law be amended to permit public two-year colleges to offer programs of less than two years' duration as regular day offerings when these programs meet the needs of persons who have graduated from high school or are beyond the usual age of high school attendance.

Abolition of the legal provision authorizing establishment of a four-year community college.

Provision that, after a local sponsoring agency acts to establish the first community college in a given geographic area, the same agency must also be the sponsor of all later community college developments in that area.

Clarification of the realms of administrative jurisdiction and responsibility of the local sponsoring agency and the local boards of trustees of community colleges so that only the latter controls institutional operations such as the development of the budget, qualifications of staff, and specifications of physical plant equipment as well as matters of program development and instruction.

Provision that when a student leaves his home area where a community college exists to attend one located *elsewhere and enrolls in a program offered by the community college in his home area, no "charge back" to the area of residence should be levied. Provides further that exception to this general rule can be made for individual students, if approved by the board of trustees of the community college in the student's area of residence.*

Establishment of another "charge back" to apply to costs incurred by a local supporting area for capital development and purchase of major equipment, with provisions similar to those relating to operating expenses.

The first of the proposals cited above would establish a statewide scholarship program for graduates of community colleges, who seek to continue their education in upper division work in four-year colleges and universities. If implemented it would probably operate much like the well-known "regents' scholarships" for high-ranking high school graduates. Such a measure is believed necessary to continue the state's long-standing policy of aiding worthy individuals to overcome barriers in the sequential progression of their educational careers. In this connection, attention should be called to another recommendation in the regents' plan which does not call for legislative action for implementation. It encourages State University and City University, in establishing new colleges which offer bachelor's and master's degree programs, to consider establishing institutions which begin at the usual junior year of college and which would build, thereby, on the programs of the community colleges.

The next two of the above propositions are related to current, proposed legislation in the state, which would provide for establishment of area programs of educational services shared among public school districts. Jointly, the two recommendations are intended to preserve the historical articulation and complementary services of high schools and community colleges in the occupational training field.

The fourth proposal would eliminate from the law a provision which has never been implemented or utilized in higher educational practice in the state. Its presence in the law, therefore, is anachronistic and misleading to the general public.

The last four recommendations cited are measures to strengthen the local control of public community colleges in their institutional boards of trustees and to improve the procedures for financing costs incurred by serving students who are not residents of the district supporting the college. The first of these would forestall repetition of a circumstance found to be disadvantageous, namely, the sponsoring of community colleges by two or more local agencies having jurisdiction in the same geographic area. In New York State, a community college must be sponsored by a local governmental body (a board of education, county board of supervisors, city council, etc.) which has taxing powers and which accepts the obligation to provide the locality's share of finances (one-third to two-thirds of operating costs, and one-half of capital costs). The controlling board of trustees does not have taxing powers and is fiscally dependent on the sponsoring agency.

The sixth recommendation cited recognizes some of the disadvantages that, in some localities, have resulted from this fiscal relationship of trustees and sponsors. It seeks to make the trustees solely and completely the controlling body of the institutional aspects of educational policy and management.

Finally, the last two proposals would require that boards of supervisors of the county of residence pay the locality's share of costs of attendance of residents to community colleges supported by other sponsoring agencies. This would be true for both operating and capital costs. No charge would be made if students left their counties of residence to enroll in courses available in their home counties.

A Time for Greatness

New times bring new demands. During the past sixteen years New York State's community colleges have been battling for recognition and acceptance. This struggle is in large measure finished. Community colleges are now more than accepted; they are counted on to do the job their leaders claim is theirs to perform.

The test is now more than ever on the leadership, the boards of trustees, the administrators, and the faculties of the institutions, for on them depends translation of the concept of the comprehensive community college into an operating reality, fully and completely. Action taken now will determine the final results of new appraisals certain to come.

Sixteen years of groundwork have set the stage for a truly great educational service by community colleges in New York State. Fulfillment of the effort depends in large measure on the extent to which plans for new action now under discussion are fully implemented.

---

[1] This era of educational history in New York State is described in a doctoral thesis, "New York, New Yorkers, and the Two-year College Movement," by Kenneth T. Doran. Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. 1961 (unpublished).

[2] *The Comprehensive Community College—Background, Objectives and Programs, Relationships to 4-Year Colleges and Universities.* A Policy Statement of the New York State Board of Regents. Albany, New York. April, 1964.

[3] *Master Plan for the City University of New York, 1964.* New York: The Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, the City University of New York, 1964.

[4] *Stature and Excellence: Focus for the Future—The Master Plan, Revised 1964.* Albany, New York: The State University of New York, 1964.

[5] *The Regents' Tentative Statewide Plan for the Expansion and Development of Higher Education, 1964.* Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, January 1965.

Rebirth in Illinois

By Clifford G. Erickson

The American public community college had its birthplace in Joliet, Illinois, in 1902. As the movement quickly spread to other parts of the nation, Illinois relinquished its leadership. In the intervening sixty-three years several other states encouraged a more rapid development of the public community college. But 1965 marks a year of rebirth and rededication in the state of Illinois. There are signs that this state will once again become a leader in community college education.

Post-high school education under the sponsorship of high school or unit district boards has been the pattern characterizing development in Illinois until the last several years. The history of the Chicago City Junior College typifies the pattern. The college was established in 1911, and after operating in several high school buildings, was consolidated in the Crane High School on the near west side, where it flourished until 1933 when, as an economy measure, it was closed. In response to public pressure the Chicago Board of Education reopened the college one year later on three campuses, one of them a separate unit, two of them shared facilities. In 1956 the board of education authorized a program of extension of campuses. At the present time there are nine locations, five of which are shared with high schools.

Elsewhere in the state this kind of development of public junior colleges was paralleled. Colleges were established under local control of unit districts. They were housed typically in high school buildings or, as in the case of Bloom Township Junior College and Belleville Junior College, in new buildings erected on the high school campus.

Until 1931, the junior college movement in Illinois grew despite the absence of specific legal sanction. In that year, the first enabling legislation was enacted to ward off continuing attacks by those who questioned the legality of a junior college in the public school system. This legislation authorized the Chicago Board of Education to "manage and provide for the maintenance of not more than one junior college, consisting of or offering not more than two years of college work beyond the four-year course of accredited high schools, as a part of the public school system of the city." This was followed in 1937 by further legislation validating existing junior colleges outside Chicago and permitting the establishment of new ones.

An Enlarged Role

The years following World War II saw the emergence of the concept of the community college as a unique element in the system of higher education demanding operations extended into the evening hours, curriculum development in vocational and technical fields, and rapid expansion of guidance and adult education services.

Administrators, faculty, and the public became aware of the need of clarifying the legal status of the junior college in Illinois and of the need of achieving firm financial support at the state level. Strong efforts were made to obtain greater recognition of the two-year college. Finally, in the closing days of the 1951 legislature, the General Assembly established the junior college as a part of the common school system.

State aid for operating costs, however, was not provided until 1955 when provision was made for $100 state aid per student per year. This sum was increased to $200 in 1957, and to $7.60 per credit hour of enrollment in 1959. The road was still far from smooth, however. Bills to provide state aid for sites, site improvement, building construction, and equipment failed in the legislature or were vetoed by the governor.

Nonetheless, the same 1959 legislative session took action to guarantee the continued progress of the community college in Illinois. The General Assembly passed a bill encouraging the establishment of separate junior college districts with separate boards and taxing authority. The bill provided for the establishment of a community college in any district approved by the state superintendent of public instruction which has at least an assessed valuation of $75 million and a population of not less than 30,000 persons.

Two years later, in 1961, Blackhawk College in Moline was the first to be organized under the Area Junior College Law. Triton Community College in Elmwood Park was organized in 1964, as was Rock Valley College in the Rockford-Belvidere area in the same year. Triton and Rock Valley offered classes for the first time in the fall of 1965.

The Illinois Master Plan

Over the years the Illinois legislature has also taken other action to further the community college cause. A number of studies of the junior college and its role in Illinois have been authorized. These studies were helpful in clarifying the role of the junior college. But they did little to help lift the junior college to its rightful position in higher education until the period 1963 to 1965.

The story of helping the community college find its place in higher education goes back to 1961 when the General Assembly created the Illinois Board of Higher Education as a successor to the former Commission on Higher Education. The new board was given authority to coordinate the budgets of the state universities and to prepare a master plan for higher education in Illinois. A series of ten study committees with memberships representing lay and professional interests completed a thorough analysis of the current status and future destiny of higher education in Illinois. Three advisory committees, one of lay persons, the second of college presidents, and the third of college faculty representatives, screened the recommendations to the board. After two years of intensive work, in 1963 the board published a tentative master plan for higher education in Illinois and conducted public hearings throughout the state for discussion and debate on the proposals of the plan. A final master plan was drafted and adopted by the board in 1964, and in 1965 a series of bills was submitted for the consideration of the Illinois legislature. Prominent among these bills was the junior college bill (House Bill 1710), introduced on May 13, passed on June 29, 1965, and signed into law by Governor Otto Kerner on July 15, 1965.

The Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois provides a significant and prescribed role for comprehensive junior colleges throughout the state. It has created an Illinois Junior College Board which has taken over the functions formerly carried out by the office of state superintendent of public instruction. It designates the junior college as a part of higher education—in contrast to its former status as a part of the common schools. It allows present junior colleges operated by high school and unit districts to continue in operation, but offers them state aid only for operation costs.

The plan encourages the development of separate junior college boards by allowing districts operating such boards to qualify for increased state aid at the rate of $11.50 per semester hour and by providing state funds for site, site improvements, and construction in the amount of three-fourths of approved project costs up to 1971 and 50 per cent of these costs thereafter. It provides a mechanism whereby any student in the state not residing in the junior college district may attend a public junior college with tuition assistance from his local district.

The Stage Is Set

The stage is now set for an unprecedented development of junior colleges in the state of Illinois in the years immediately ahead. Whereas presently one college student in five is enrolled in a junior college, it can be confidently expected that in the years ahead a much larger percentage of college-level students will be enrolled in community colleges. Unit and high school district boards will undoubtedly divest themselves of junior colleges and encourage the establishment of separate junior college districts in order that the benefits to be derived from increased state funds for operation and for construction can be made available to local communities.

In December, 1965, the Illinois Junior College Board reported that ninety of 102 counties were served by community colleges or had studies underway for the creation of new junior colleges.

Authorities on the junior college throughout the country have expressed the view that the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education may well be the best in the nation. If it is and if it works, Illinois may reassume the position of junior college leadership it had in 1902.

Iowa Sets Its Course

By Louis R. Newsham

The first junior college in Iowa was established at Mason City in 1918 without the benefit of a specific legal basis.

Enabling legislation, passed in 1927, permitted a local school district to establish a junior college when approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and when duly authorized by the voters.

Thirty-six junior colleges were started between the years 1918 and 1953. At the present time there are sixteen public community and junior colleges in operation.

Unlike those of the more populous states, Iowa's institutions have been characterized by extremely small staffs and enrollments, dual use of high school facilities and staff, and limited financial support. Consequently, development of the junior and community college in Iowa has been a slow and painful process. In fact, the inadequate structural base for the institutions and the drop in enrollments caused by World War II forced more than 50 per cent of these institutions to close prior to 1950.

In recent years the need for basic changes in support and organizational structure has become increasingly clear to Iowans. A number of informal and formal reports, designed to promote new structures have been developed.[1]

These reports have differed in detail, but they have pointed to certain inescapable conclusions highlighted by:

1. The need for a statewide plan to serve *all* areas of Iowa
2. The need for an adequate financial base to support a varied program of instruction

3. The need for an adequate number of potential students in the areas to be served.

The Iowa General Assembly, at its regular session in 1965, enacted a basic law under which a statewide system of not more than twenty area vocational schools or community colleges may be established.[2]

This law provides permissive legislation, which opens wider the door of educational opportunity for Iowa youths and adults. The issue of area vocational schools versus community colleges has been subordinated to that of serving the educational needs of Iowa. Vocational-technical education is made a *must* by the law. This fact is underlined by the stipulation that an area community college is not permitted to exist apart from a vocational-technical school. Here is a legal requirement that the community college shall be the comprehensive educational institution so widely proclaimed by the literature in the field. Heretofore, no such guarantee has been present in the Iowa educational structure.

Thus, the legislature, speaking for the people of Iowa, has forced the parallel movements of college transfer education and vocational-technical education into a single stream.

A controlled pattern of offerings is designated by the new bill. Specifically, if the new institution operates as an area community college, it is required to offer (but not limited to) the following:

1. The first two years of college work, including preprofessional education
2. Vocational and technical training
3. Programs for in-service training and retraining of workers
4. Programs for high school completion for students of post-high school age
5. Programs for all students of high school age who may best serve themselves by enrolling for vocational and technical training while also enrolled in a local high school, public or private
6. Student personnel services
7. Community services
8. Vocational education for persons who have

academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent their succeeding in regular vocational education programs

9. Training, retraining, and all necessary preparation for productive employment of all citizens.

The proposed state plan developed in 1962 by the State Department of Public Instruction for providing a statewide system of public community colleges appears to be a logical general guide to follow as this permissive legislation is implemented.[3]

The act provides that county boards of education of two or more counties are authorized to plan for the merger of county school systems for the purpose of providing an area vocational school or community college.

No area may be proposed that has fewer than 4,000 public and private school pupils in grades nine through twelve.

All proposals for merger areas must be approved by the State Board of Public Instruction. This approval must insure the development of a statewide plan for post-high school education which includes *all* areas of the state. Upon approval of a proposed merged area, the respective county boards—after public notice—must proceed to accept or reject the merger plan.

The supportive areas into which the state is to be divided must each provide an adequate financial and potential student base. Since this was one of the criteria for developing the department's proposed state plan, it seems to follow that the twenty or fewer area districts as provided for in the new law should very much resemble the sixteen-area district plan suggested in its report.

The governing board for a merged area will consist of one member from each director district in the area. Each director will be selected by the electors of the respective district.

The director districts in the area will be limited to no fewer than five nor more than nine and must be of approximately equal population.

The board of directors will be authorized to levy a tax of three-fourths mill for operating costs. This levy will require no approval by the voters of the district.

A school building tax levy not to exceed three-fourths mill in any one year and limited to a period of five years may be authorized by a vote of the people. This could be used for the purchase of grounds, construction of buildings, the acquisition of libraries, and for the purpose of maintaining, remodeling, improving, or expanding the area school.

Each area district when authorized by a vote of the people, may issue bonds to raise funds for building an area vocational school or area community college. In this connection the new districts have the same bonding privileges that are extended to other school districts. The bond issue must be approved by a 60 per cent majority of all voters voting on the proposition in the area.

State aid for area district students is at the rate of $2.25 per student per day payable for the actual number of days the college is officially in session. Aid remains the same for resident students attending junior or community colleges supported by a local school district. This is at the rate of $1 per day for a maximum of 180 days. The aid for nonresident students attending junior or community colleges supported by a local school district is $2.25 per day for a maximum of 180 days. Area district schools have no limitation on the number of days for which aid will be paid.

State-Level Organization

The requirement that there be a division of community and junior colleges with a full-time director within the State Department of Public Instruction is important. It insures the organization and personnel necessary to give leadership and direction to the present community or junior colleges and the developing area community colleges.

Robert O. Birkhimer, director of junior colleges in the Illinois State Department of Public Instruction for the past six years, has been employed by the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction as community college director.

A newly created state advisory committee on community and junior colleges, parallel to the already established advisory committee on vocational education, will play a key role in the early development of the area districts serving post-high school needs. This advisory committee will advise the state board on the establishment of area community colleges and on the adoption of standards for area and public community and junior colleges.

The nine-member state advisory committee on community and junior colleges will be appointed by the governor. It will include three members to represent the general public and one to represent each of the following groups:

1. State Board of Regents
2. State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education
3. Private universities and colleges
4. Public and private junior colleges
5. Associations which have been established for the purpose of furthering the education and training of individuals with academic, socioeconomic, and other handicaps
6. Local school districts which offer programs of vocational education.

The new law further specifies that all public community junior colleges currently in operation may continue to operate and may be converted into area vocational schools or area community colleges in a manner provided for in the act. All agreements for such conversion are subject to approval by the State Board of Public Instruction. Reasonable compensation will be paid to any local district whose community college facilities are used for the area district.

Through Adolescence

All individuals must go through the adolescent stage of life, and this cycle cannot be bypassed by wishful thinking on the part of parents. It appears that Iowa is destined to live through its share of "adolescence." Differing points of view arising from varied personal, political, and professional orientation of the proponents of post-high school education need to be harmonized. This takes time. The new law appears to provide a vehicle to carry Iowa through its next growth-stage in its progress toward an adequate, statewide community college system.

The stage for a comprehensive approach to Iowa's post-high school educational problems has been set by actions of an aggressive State Department of Public Instruction, professional cooperation by educators, leadership by the governor, and alert legislative enactments by the Sixty-First General Assembly.

The emergence of an area system of post-high school education which will guarantee the availability of vocational-technical courses and provide for the initial or later addition of full community college work is regarded by many Iowa educators and laymen as an intermediate step toward a statewide system of comprehensive area community colleges.

It is worth reemphasizing that the new legislation provides the area district board of directors with a ready means of changing from an area vocational-technical school to an area community college.

Governor Harold E. Hughes has emphasized the need in Iowa for vocational-technical education and has been a leading proponent for legislation necessary for establishing area schools. In an address to the Economic Development Conference at the University of Iowa, preceding the Sixty-First General Assembly, Governor Hughes stated:

> *It is my belief that the enrollment in the schools should not be restricted, that tuition should not be high, and that there should be sufficient diversity of programs to accommodate the interests and abilities of most students.*
>
> *I think the main use of the comprehensive area schools should be for those who will terminate their education with a two-year course, but that a secondary purpose would be to provide a two-year transfer course.*
>
> *This approach to the establishment of an area vocational-technical training system in Iowa, using a comprehensive community college set-up where feasible, is a combination of a number of recommendations offered by*

leading educators in Iowa—and I believe it would have a broad base of support in the state.

I would emphasize again these characteristics of this approach that I think are particularly important—flexibility in adapting to local needs and existing facilities; the placing of the vocational-technical program in the setting of the state's general education system; local control of the schools, with a modest local participation in the financing; and with standards and coordination of programs provided by the state agency ultimately designated to supervise the program.

I realize that there will be many objections to this or any other plan—but the time has arrived when we must get down to specifics, work out our differences, and get moving.[4]

It seems reasonable to conclude that the pressures of cost, enrollment, and program expansion make it just a matter of time before the present public community-junior colleges operated by single local districts, take their place in a statewide area plan. If the history of other states is indicative of future developments, the people of Iowa will see the gradual evolution of a strong system of comprehensive community colleges.

---

[1] Starrak, James A., and Hughes, Raymond M. *The Community College in the United States.* Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1954.

Educational Needs: *Iowa's Young Adults.* Developed at the Annual Junior College Workshop held at the State University of Iowa. Des Moines: Department of Public Instruction, State of Iowa, 1951.

Gibson, Raymond C. *Resources and Needs for Higher Education in Iowa,* 1960-1970: *A Summary Report.* State House, Des Moines: Iowa Legislative Research Bureau, undated.

Education Beyond High School Age: The Community College. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Report to the Sixtieth General Assembly. Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1962.

[2] *Senate File 550,* Sixty-First General Assembly, 1965. An act to provide for establishment and operation of area vocational schools and area community colleges, establish a division of community and junior colleges within the state department of public instruction and an advisory committee to the state board of public instruction on community and junior colleges, and to require establishment and enforcement of approval standards for public and

area community and junior colleges and area vocational schools.

[3] *Education Beyond High School Age: The Community College. op. cit.*

[4] Hughes, Harold E. *The Path for Progress.* Address by Governor Harold E. Hughes, Third Annual Economic Development Conference, Iowa State University, Ames, December 8, 1964 (unpublished).

Hawaii Plans for Community Colleges

By Richard H. Kosaki

Education has always played a major role in the life of Hawaii. It is through education that the native and diverse immigrant groups in Hawaii have molded a thriving American community.

At present, Hawaii's high school retention rate is among the best in the nation. In recent years, consistently over 65 per cent of the high school graduates have proceeded on to some kind of post-high school education. The University of Hawaii, the state's major institution of higher education, has shown a 200 per cent increase in enrollment in the last fifteen years; from 5,000 students in 1950 to its present 15,000.

These rapid developments in education have been accompanied and abetted by Hawaii's fast-growing economy. Recent advances in transportation and communication have made Hawaii a hub of economic and cultural activities in the Pacific. Technological changes have increased productive efficiency and have brought demands for training in new skills.

Against this background of educational and economic advancement, the coming of community colleges to Hawaii was almost inevitable. Indeed, one is tempted to ask why it is occurring so late in a community so conscious of the value of education.

But now that the decision to establish a statewide network of community colleges has been made the support is overwhelming and the state impatiently awaits the opening of its first campus.

Past Studies

Although the decision to establish community colleges is recent, proposals for their creation have been suggested for some time. All of the recent surveys on education in Hawaii contained recommendations for their establishment. The Stanford Report of 1957 suggested "the development of regional community colleges on the larger islands."[1] A 1962 report on higher education in Hawaii, conducted by personnel of the U. S. Office of Education, made the establishment of community colleges one of its major recommendations.[2] The 1963 Hawaii Legislature asked for a detailed feasibility study, and, upon the findings and recommendations of this report,[3] enacted the Community College Act of 1964.[4]

The Community College Act of 1964 was passed by an overwhelming margin in both houses of the legislature and signed by a governor who had campaigned for a system of community colleges. The act is brief and states the purposes of community colleges in broad terms: "to provide two-year college transfer and general education programs, semiprofessional, technical, vocational, and continuing education programs, and such other educational programs and services as are appropriate to such institutions."

Provisions of the Act

The act contains three provisions which are noteworthy:

1. It establishes a statewide system of community colleges under the University board of regents.
2. It authorizes the transfer of the existing technical schools from the Department of Education to the University of Hawaii and their conversion into community colleges.
3. It excludes the island of Hawaii from the provisions of the act.

The exclusion of Hawaii, the largest island, can largely be explained in terms of the existence of a two-year branch campus of the University on that island. There is a desire on the part of members of the community to develop this branch campus not into a community college but into a four-year college. A few blocks from the branch campus is a successful technical school; in combination they do provide for the island of Hawaii greater educational opportunities than currently exist on the neighboring islands. The exclusion of the island of Hawaii under these circumstances will provide an interesting comparison of two different ways of providing post-high school educational opportunities within the state.

A feature of the Hawaii system which interests many (and disappoints some) is the key role that the university assumes. Given the centralized nature of government and all education in Hawaii, local school board control was never given serious consideration. The other organizational control choices were: (a) an independent state board which was mentioned in legislative discussions but dismissed as adding unnecessary complexity to educational organization in a small state; and (b) the Board of Education which was passed over on the grounds that community colleges belonged in the province of higher education.

The dangers of university control are well-known; chief among them is that the university will stultify the proper development of community colleges by tight controls over the "academic" programs and by de-emphasizing or being indifferent to occupational programs.

But there is also the possibility that this relationship, like marriage, contains the potential for increasing the effectiveness and mutual well-being of both parties. Transfer problems should be effectively handled and the greater university resources in the arts and sciences ought to be taken advantage of by the outlying communities through the community colleges.

Of interest is the organizational pattern adopted by the university regents to administer the community colleges.

The regents intend to treat the community colleges as "equal partners" or integral segments in the state's higher education program. Of importance also is the fact that University of Hawaii's president, Thomas H. Hamilton, has an understanding of community colleges, gained in his previous position as president of the State University of New York which includes among its campuses several community colleges.

The community colleges will also have local citizens' committees appointed to advise on the development of individual campuses. Trade advisory committees, now in use by the technical schools, will be retained.

Occupational Education

The most discussed aspect of the Community College Act was the role of occupational education. The growing importance of occupational education was recognized, but what programs should be assigned to the community colleges? The question was made complex by the existence of the technical schools (area vocational post-high schools) under the Department of Education, which quite naturally wished to retain their status and identity.

The decision to make Hawaii's community colleges truly comprehensive by including all phases of post-high school occupational education was arrived at in the belief that this was best for the student. Not only would he have the widest choice available but he would also be treated equally in terms of the co-curricular experiences which add much to post-high school education.

The University of Hawaii is well-aware of its responsibility in occupational education. After passage of the Community College Act, it secured the services of Norman C. Harris, of the University of Michigan, to evaluate the existing technical school programs and to suggest plans for future occupational programs. Professor Harris' comprehensive report[5] will serve as a useful guide in the development of Hawaii's community colleges.

On July 1, 1965, by executive order of the governor, four technical schools with the following programs were transferred to the University of Hawaii. They now constitute the beginning of the community college system.

Occupational Programs	*Technical Schools and Enrollments (Fall, 1964)*				
	Honolulu	*Kapiolani*	*Kauai*	*Maui*	*Total*
Aircraft technology	65	—	—	—	65
Apparel trades	21	—	—	24	45
Automotive technology	111	—	24	48	183
Building trades	60	—	24	38	122
Business education	—	627	65	78	770
Cosmetology	67	—	—	—	67
Electricity	39	—	—	—	39
Electronics	125	—	—	—	125
Engineering aide	16	—	—	—	16
Hotel, restaurant and food trades	45	72	—	—	117
Machine shop	33	—	7	14	54
Metal and welding trades	71	—	11	21	103
Health occupations	—	118	—	—	118
Refrigeration and air conditioning	39	—	—	—	39
Total	692	817	131	223	1,853

To the above will be added such occupational programs as registered nursing (now at the university with the understanding that it will be shifted to a community college as soon as facilities are built), police science, more options in the secretarial and business administration programs, and expanded programs in the hotel-restaurant fields. All campuses will have college transfer programs, as well as extended day or evening programs.

Thus, community colleges offering associate degrees in occupational and college transfer programs are expected to be established on Maui in 1967, and on Oahu and Kauai in 1968.

The five community colleges will differ in enrollments and programs. The larger ones on Oahu will be planned for 4,000-5,000 full-time day students; the smaller neighbor island campuses may not enroll more than 500 to 700.

The library and theater facilities will be designed to serve the surrounding communities. Community colleges, especially in areas outside of urban Honolulu, should become educational and cultural centers of their region.

Three major tasks now confront those planning Hawaii's community college system:

1. The construction of five campuses. Two are extensions of present technical school sites, two call for the relocation of existing facilities, and one will be an entirely new campus. Classrooms, libraries, and campus centers are being planned for all. The architects are being challenged to design functional yet inviting structures in a warm and friendly climate.

2. The development of new programs and the possible revision of existing programs. Considerable work needs to be done in this area. Besides the college transfer program, new occupational programs will have to be added on most campuses. The statewide system calls for the careful planning and placement of new or expensive programs.

3. The recruitment of faculty and staff. The present faculties of the technical schools have responded well to the conversion; many are already undertaking courses to increase their knowledge of community college operations. They will need to be augmented by able instructors from within and without the state.

Hawaii's community college system has some unique features. But the underlying purpose is clear —to provide citizens with greater opportunities in post-high school education.

Hawaii, with her traditional and proven reliance upon education to better the life of her people, has focused her attention upon community colleges. With growing public understanding and support the community college has a golden opportunity to prove itself in Hawaii.

---

[1] Hanna, Paul R., and McDaniel, Henry B. *General Curriculum and Vocational Curriculum,* Organization and Administration of the Public Schools, Territory of

Hawaii, by the Odell Survey Staff. Stanford, California: June 30, 1957, pp. 76-77.

[2] U.S. Office of Education. *The University of Hawaii and Higher Education in Hawaii.* Report of a survey by S. V. Martorana, Ernest V. Hollis, and staff members of the Division of Higher Education. Honolulu: Department of Budget and Review, November 1962, pp. 266-67.

[3] Kosaki, Richard H. *Feasibility of Community Colleges in Hawaii.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, February, 1964.

[4] Act 39 of the *Session Laws of Hawaii,* 1964.

[5] Harris, Norman C. *Curriculum Development for Hawaii's Community Colleges with Emphasis on Occupational Education.* Honolulu: The University of Hawaii, December, 1964.

Minnesota Turns to State Junior Colleges

By Philip C. Helland

In the closing days of its 1963 session the Minnesota Legislature passed a law which has already had a profound effect upon the development of junior colleges in Minnesota—a law which begins with the statement that "Not to exceed fifteen state junior colleges are hereby established under the management, jurisdiction, and control of a state junior college board which is hereby created."

At the time the new law was passed there were eleven public junior colleges in Minnesota, all operated by local school districts under the regulations of the Minnesota State Board of Education.

These colleges had a long tradition of local support and local control. Rochester Junior College had operated continuously since 1915, Hibbing since 1916, Eveleth since 1918, Virginia since 1921, Ely and Itasca since 1922, Worthington since 1936, Brainerd since 1938, and Austin since 1940. The junior college at Fergus Falls had been opened in 1960 and the one in Willmar in 1962.

Financial support of each of these colleges had been entirely the responsibility of the local school district in which it was located until 1957 when the state legislature authorized state aid for operation in the amount of $200 per pupil. This amount was raised to $250 in 1959, to $300 in 1961, and to $350 in 1963.

The locally supported junior colleges in Minnesota were handicapped by the lack of adequate funds and by the fact that they were usually housed with the high school, and as a result their programs were largely college transfer in nature. The colleges saw semiprofessional and technical education as a great need but the school districts were not able to supply the space and equipment needed for such programs. In the college transfer programs the colleges established an excellent reputation and studies showed that their students performed well after transfer. The schools were able to attract and hold excellent faculty members, and made real contributions to the educational and cultural life of their communities.

Even with state aid, the locally supported junior colleges could not keep up with expanding enrollments and the need for broader programs. The building of facilities was still a local responsibility, and the districts had all they could do to keep up with the need for facilities at the elementary and secondary school level. Metropolitan districts which should have started junior colleges did not do so because of the financial problems involved. The 1963 legislature realized that Minnesota's junior colleges would not be able to do what would be expected of them in the future unless they became completely state-supported, and faced the problem squarely in the passage of the new law.

The original law was very brief. It provided for a State Junior College Board of five members, to be appointed by the governor, and gave the board all powers necessary to the management, jurisdiction, and control of the state junior colleges. It required that at least three of the state junior colleges should be situated in the five-county, metropolitan area which includes Minneapolis and St. Paul and their suburbs. It gave the board authority to determine the location of other area junior colleges and directed that consideration should be given to the needs for a state junior college in northwestern Minnesota. It provided that the board could take existing public junior colleges into the state system if it desired to do so, and if the colleges desired such takeover, and it prescribed a tuition rate equal to that charged in the four-year state colleges. It anticipated concern over loss of local control and required the board to appoint local advisory committees in areas where state junior colleges would be located. It directed the board to prescribe courses of study, including undergraduate academic programs, training in semiprofessional and technical fields, and adult education.

The Minnesota Junior College Board was appointed in the fall of 1963 and the writer was hired as its executive director in March, 1964. Board members had visited all existing junior colleges during the winter of 1963-64 and in the spring of 1964 received requests for take-over from each of the existing colleges. The board agreed to take all of the colleges into the state system and to operate them at state expense, with the provision that since they are only four miles apart the colleges at Virginia and Eveleth will eventually be consolidated.

When the eleven colleges opened in the fall of 1964 they were state junior colleges. An "Agreement for Take-over" had been made between the Minnesota Junior College Board and each local board of education which provided that the state board would pay all costs of operation and that the local board would make its facilities available until state-owned facilities could be built. The state board agreed to pay faculty members according to the 1964-65 salary agreements already made with the local districts and to repay out-of-pocket costs that the local district incurred on behalf of the college. A spirit of enthusiasm and cooperation existed, and the transition was made with a minimum of difficulty.

Administrative patterns developed during the first year of operation make the local administrators, who are called deans, relatively autonomous but require that their access to the state board be through its executive director.

Budget requests for the entire system are made to the legislature by the state board. Appropriations are made to the system, rather than to individual colleges, and the state board has authority to vary ratios and formulas from college to college. Deans do their own hiring within ratios authorized by the state board but payrolls are prepared and checks issued in the state office. Individual colleges initiate requisitions for equipment and supplies within allocations made by the state board but actual purchasing and payment is handled by the state office with the help of the state department of administration. Funds for buildings are requested for the entire system by the state board.

More Colleges, Programs, Facilities

Except for these changes in administrative patterns, the colleges are operating much as they did under local school districts. In looking to the future, however, the state board is committed to a program of additional colleges, broader programs and improved facilities.

The 1965 legislature responded to recommendations by the state board in authorizing expansion to a system of seventeen colleges. In addition to the ten colleges which would exist after the consolidation of Virginia and Eveleth, the legislature authorized a new college at Thief River Falls in the northwest corner of the state, a new college at International Falls on the Canadian border, and five new colleges in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan complex. It provided that the metropolitan colleges could each develop at more than one location if the board deemed it wise. It asked the board to make a study of the need for additional junior colleges, giving special attention to eight areas—the Fairmont area, the Redwood Falls-Sleepy Eye-Springfield area, the Pine City-Mora area, the Hastings-Wabasha area, the Owatonna-Albert Lea area, and the Wadena - Park Rapids-Detroit Lakes area.

The state board asked for an appropriation for operations which would provide for uniform salary treatment in all state junior colleges according to a schedule developed by the Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association, for new colleges in temporary quarters at Thief River Falls and in the metropolitan area, and for a doubled enrollment by the end of the biennium. These appropriations were granted almost as requested. The faculty association had hoped for immediate implementation of the schedule they had proposed, but settled for implementation over a two-year period.

New Openings This Fall and Next

The state board asked for new buildings that would enable the existing colleges to be in facilities separate from high schools by 1967 and would also provide for the start of one new metropolitan campus by 1967. The request was granted, and the legislature went further by providing for the start of two new metropolitan campuses during the biennium. Plans are now being developed for "first units" at these various locations—buildings that will provide classrooms, laboratories, faculty and administrative offices, libraries, lecture halls, and multipurpose rooms. The legislative building commission and the state board have agreed upon a plan which will develop the various campuses concurrently and spread available money into as many institutions as possible.

New colleges were opened this fall at Thief River Falls and at two locations in the metropolitan area, all in space made available by high schools. Plans are being made for additional temporary locations in the fall of 1966.

The Minnesota Junior College Board is working with the newly established Minnesota Liaison and Facilities Commission for Higher Education in planning a long-range program for the development of its system of state junior colleges. The board is committed to the idea that Minnesota's state junior colleges should, as far as possible, be comprehensive institutions with a community-oriented approach. It has met with strong support from the legislature and from the public. It is convinced, as are its administrators, that the state junior college is the answer for Minnesota.